THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH

Volume XV JUNE, 1929 Number 2

ON STANDARDIZING PRONUNCIATION[1]

J. DUNCAN SPAETH
Princeton University

LET me begin by saying that I realize that on the subject assigned to me it is difficult to be definite without being dogmatic. Approaching the complicated and controversial problem of standardizing pronunciation from the point of view of the student of language rather than from that of the teacher responsible for the speech-habits of his students, I shall ask you to consider my remarks as an essay in orientation rather than a defense of lawlessness or a plea for law enforcement in the realm of speech. In other words I have asked myself what light does the historic and scientific approach to language, and more specifically the English language as spoken in America, throw on the Art of Speech, in so far as this art involves recognition of and conformity to fixed or changing standards of pronunciation.

In Galsworthy's Forsyte-Saga there is an observation which furnishes me an admirable text for my linguistic sermon. It runs as follows:

> Love is no hot-house flower, but a wild plant, born of a wet night, born of an hour of sun-shine, sprung of wild seed, blown along the road by a wild wind: a wild plant that when it blooms by chance within the hedge of our gardens we call a flower, but when it blooms outside we call a weed.

This distinction between weeds and flowers applies not only to love but to the less romantic but equally universal phenomena of lan-

[1] Address delivered at the opening session of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, Princeton, April 5, 1929.

guage without which love itself would have remained a mere instinct, an inarticulate glow of life, but through which it touches and animates every faculty of the human spirit. From the point of view of the linguistic puritan, all the plants of speech that grow within our own garden are flowers, and all others weeds. From the point of view of the linguistic naturalist, the distinction between weeds and flowers is an artificial one; to him weeds may be even more interesting than flowers, wild varieties may serve better to illustrate the life of language and its laws of growth, than cultivated varieties. To him, dialects, local peculiarities of speech, colloquialisms, slang, provincialisms,—mere weeds to the purist—are the wild flowers of speech from which by cultivation and conscious selection the standard garden varieties have sprung. It is worth noting that the historic and genetic study of language is a phase of that naturalistic revolution which characterized the closing years of the 18th century, and which was reinforced by the application of the evolutionary idea to nature and to man and which when applied to language made living speech in all its dialectal and local variations, rather than the literary standard transmitted through writing and print, the basis of linguistic study.

But though naturalism prevailed in the science of language, puritanism constantly asserted itself in the realm of the practical, manifesting itself as a determined and resolute effort to clear the enclosed gardens of weeds, and to bring larger and larger areas of speech within the recognized boundaries of linguistic horticulture.

We are concerned here with the problem of standardization, as a phase of speech cultivation, only in so far as it affects pronunciation. In grammar, vocabulary, and orthography the processes of standardization have advanced much farther than in pronunciation. Englishmen and Americans write much more nearly alike than they speak, and the literary standard of the English-speaking peoples is now fairly fixed and uniform the world over. In the passage I quoted from Galsworthy there is nothing to suggest that it was written by an Englishman rather than by an American, yet if he were to read it to you, you would immediately recognize it as "British" English and as different from the "American" English in which I have read the passage to you. The very fact that orthography became fixed while pronunciation kept changing, has made it more difficult to fix a standard for pro-

nunciation, because it is evident that neither in England nor in America, neither in New England, or the South, or the West, can the standard of orthography be made the basis for establishing a standard of pronunciation. In so far as the spelling reformers are consistent in their attempt to make the written word conform to the spoken word, they are inevitably attacking the uniformity of standard attained in the written language, and find themselves in the dilemma of either recognizing an indefinite number of variants as "correct" phonetically, or of establishing a uniform standard of pronunciation which they themselves would be the first to admit is an impossibility. Spelling is a convention and like most conventions irrational, but it is a convenient irrationalty in so far as it is uniform. Like any other human institution, language is an instrumentality, and its efficiency is not determined by its rationality but by its ability to serve its purpose, which in the case of language is communication. In the case of orthography, then, usage has been fixed into law, which in so far as it is uniform is enforceable. In the case of pronunciation usage is still free and plastic, and in so far as it is not uniform it is not enforceable.

From what has been said it is clear that we have two distinct avenues of approach to the problem of a standard of pronunciation.

1. The Normative. Those who approach the problem from this angle are primarily interested in setting up a *norm* of pronunciation, conformity to which is the basis of value judgments, aesthetic and even ethical.

To this group belong the older school of lexicographers in so far as they attempted to indicate pronunciation. They set up as law-makers for language and very generally failed to recognize the importance of usage and the priority of usage to standards, falling into the chronic error of the legislative mind that tries to establish custom by law instead of enacting custom into law by definition and formulation. The pedagogic interest was inevitably on the side of the normative approach. The dictionary was considered a source of verbal inspiration containing an authoritative revelation of correctness in speech, and the general popular ignorance as to the processes of linguistic growth and the rise of standard forms, reinforced this respect for the dictionary and the grammar-book, until it became a form of lexicolatry, a superstitious respect for the prejudices and preferences of the self-appointed promulgators of

linguistic decalogs. While religious heretics had the honor of being burned, linguistic heretics were merely scorned, and branded as the vulgar and illiterate.

2. The other avenue of approach is the descriptive and genetic which attempts to record the actual usage prevalent in different speech areas and to trace the processes by which certain usages came to be "naturalized" in areas where they were not originally native, thus assuming the dignity and importance of standard forms.

Excessive emphasis on the normative approach breeds dogmatism, resulting from insufficient acquaintance with the facts of speech. Excessive emphasis on the historic and genetic approach breeds indifferentism, an attitude of *laissez faire*, which fails to recognize that language like every other human institution is amenable to cultivation and that precisely what distinguishes civilization from barbarism, and civilized speech from primitive and barbaric utterance is the conscious effort toward improvement on the part of individuals and social groups through conformity to recognized standards of excellence.

Coming now from these very general considerations to the question of standardizing the pronunciation of English, every teacher in the field of speech education should know the main types or varieties of usage that prevail in different areas of English speech, before determining to recognize any one as a standard for himself or as a norm of instruction. In a brief address it is impossible to do more than indicate the main groups and suggest some salient features, but I should like to recommend to all who are seriously interested in the problem the excellent survey of Professor C. K. Thomas.*

There is first the standard of British usage based on the pronunciation of Southern English as practised by cultivated speakers in that area. Its salient features are: (1) the use of the "broad" *a* in words like *France, bath, pass.* (2) the substitution of the "vowel-glide" for the consonantal *r*, as in *hear, bear, far, hard, firm, force*, etc. (3) the prevalence of the recessive accent in words like *library, lit*è*rary*, etc.

* "Recent Discussions of Standardization in American Pronunciation," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education*, Vol XIII, 1927, pp. 442-457.

Few today would advocate the adoption of this as a standard of pronunciation in America. It is not even universally recognized by Englishmen as a binding authority, and claims have been set up for "Northern" English which in many respects is closer to American usage than Southern English.

There are three main areas of American usage. The New England "standard" is in several important respects in closer agreement with the Southern English standard than with the usage prevalent in other portions of America, notably in the treatment of the *r* before consonants and at the end of words when the next word does not begin with a vowel. Like Southern English its claim to recognition is not based on numbers and extension, but on literary and social prestige. The second main area of American usage is the Southern, covering the southeastern portion of the United States, and in the treatment of the *r* agreeing in the main with Southern British and New England usage. The third main area is the Middle Region (Prof. Kenyon's Northern English) tending westward from New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, and extending fan-shaped to the Pacific Coast, where, if we except recent speakers from New England and the South, one hears practically the same pronunciation from Seattle to San Diego, and where the degree of uniformity is much greater than even in the Eastern Middle region. It has been estimated that while the New England area comprises about thirteen million speakers, and the Southern area about thirty million, the "middle" region usage comprises nearly seventy million. If numerical preponderance were the only factor to be considered, there would be no question as to the type that will eventually become established as standard in America. The salient characteristic of this middle type is the prevalence of the *āē* instead of broad *a* in words like *France, bath, pass,* and the uniform employment of a consonantal *r* (voiced or unvoiced, cf. *bray, pray, dray, tray, grow, crow*) in all positions, even those where Souhern English and New England usage drops it and uses the voice glide, as in *bar, hard, Shakespeare, work,* etc. A word should be said about the diphthong used in New York speech where the neutral vowel, — as in *bird, word, hurt, clerk, heard,* is followed by *r* plus consonant. Popular transcriptions like *boid, woid, hoit,* etc., fail to give the initial element of this diphthong as used by cultivated speakers, and even such acute ob-

servers as Krapp and Kenyon have failed to note the extent to which this speech is a characteristic of cultivated speech. Owing to the fact that many finishing schools, especially for young women, are situated in this area, it has in its cultivated form a prestige that is not suggested by the popular caricaturists. A cultivated New Yorker will use three distinct *r's* in these three words, *stir, stirred, stir up.* In the first he will eliminate the *r* and substitute the voice glide. In the second he will introduce the decreasing diphthong and in the third he will use the typical American consonantal *r.* In my own speech (Philadelphia) I use the same *r* in all three positions, and from a practical point of view it would seem that the uniform consonantal *r* employed by the overwhelming majority of American speakers, has certain advantages over the varieties of substitutes adopted in the areas above described. No one should think of "imposing'" the consonantal *r* on speakers in a region where usage has made other forms prevalent, but by the same token the adoption of the voice glide and other substitutes by speakers in whose communities these pronunciations are not native is not speech education but speech affectation.

This leads us to consider finally what is the nature of the sanction that makes any type of pronunciation "standard." I shall suggest three such sanctions that may be brought forward in support of one among competing types. There is the sanction of numerical preponderance, the sanction of social prestige, the sanction of cultivated usage. In a democratic society numerical preponderance will always be considered as a valid sanction, whereas in an aristocratic society social prestige will be the predominant factor. Conformity to the usage of the majority, merely because it is a majority, is to the lover of excellence mere vulgarity. Conformity to the usage of a social elite, merely because it is an exclusive minority, is to the man of self-reliant democratic temper, mere snobbishness. Between these extremes lies the *via media* of cultivated usage, that is to say instead of setting up an absolute standard on the basis of the practise of the majority or an elite-minority, each speaker chooses to conform to his native pronunciation as modified by the usage of cultivated speakers *of that type of spoken English.* This is a practical rule easier to follow in America than in England, because with us speech-habits and fashions of pronunciation are not considered marks of cultivation to the extent to which they are in England.

Let me close with three practical suggestions that I make bold to offer to you as teachers of speech. (1) Even though you are not primarily concerned with problems of origins, and the rise of standards from local dialects, it is important to have a historic background for your work. Every teacher of speech should be familiar with such books as Professor Krapp's *The English Language in America* and Professor Kenyon's *American Pronunciation.* Whether you agree with their conclusions as regards standardization or not, you should be familiar with the facts on which these conclusions are based. (2.) Practical training in phonetics is essential both to the historical student and to the practitioner in the Art of Speech. It is more important for you to conform to your own standard intelligently and with conscious mastery than to attempt to conform to an alien standard unintelligently and in a slip-shod articulation, (3.) Every cultivated speaker, who uses speech professionally should be able to use both formal and informal modes of speech and should instinctively be able to use in the right situation the form best adapted to his ends. This will help to solve the problem of "naturalness" and "artificiality." If language is the dress of thought, a well furnished speaker's wardrobe will have both negligée and full-dress suits, and he ought to be equally at home in each.

But what in fine is cultivated speech? How is it to be cultivated? Here we touch deeper issues. It is more important to cultivate refinement of feeling and of thought than refinement of pronunciation. In listening to some speakers I have been tempted to change the epigram "What you *are* speaks so loud I cannot hear what you say," into "What you say, and the way you say it speaks so loud, I cannot disover who or what you are." The highest art is to convey the sense of uniqueness, freshness, spontaneity, originality, individuality through a medium which is a recognized instrument of communication and which does not obtrude itself as a mannerism on the hearer. Failure to observe this time-honored maxim of moderation, of temperate balance, will result, on the one hand, in emphasizing self-expression at the expense of communication and, on the other hand, in emphasizing facility of communication at the expense of depth of expression. We are familiar with the artist, speaker or otherwise, who is so intent on self-expression that he fails to communicate what he expresses; and

on the other hand with the one who is so intent on communication, on "getting it across" that he communicates nothing worth expressing. Language is an art both of expression and of communication, and the art of speech is the art of dealing with the most living and therefore subtle and elusive spirit of language. Communication without expression is futile. But expression without communication is fatal.

> "'Tis a tale
> Told by an idiot full of sound and fury,
> Signifying—nothing."

GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S THEORY OF STAGE REPRESENTATION[1]

EVELYN D'ANGELO
Hunter College

EVEN though George Bernard Shaw's plays and socialistic writings are universally read, his views on stage representation, scattered here and there among his critical works, are little known. As dramatic critic for the London *Saturday Review* and later as director of many of his own plays, Shaw has applied his critical acumen so closely to the art of the theatre that his observations should prove of interest to all students of the theatre. At times we may have misinterpreted some Shavian views in collecting and arranging the hints to theory available, but the practical value of his advice to (and abuse of) actors seems to warrant this attempt.

However we seek a fundamental theory underlying all of Shaw's ideas on the theatre, we find him expressing again and again something that approximates a constant principle. This principle is characterized by the words *natural* and *real*, both of which have caused considerable confusion in the theatre from time to time. They occur repeatedly in Shaw's estimation of an actor's art, in his opinions on the duties of playwrights, and in his formulation of the requirements necessary for costume and scenery. We may, I think, safely take it for granted that the following statement is a simple and concise expression of Shaw's principle:

[1] Stage representation—Shaw's term for what we usually call play production.

> The beginning and end of the business . . . is the art of making the audience believe that real things are happening to real people.[2]

Plays, therefore, must be real; stagey plays, the antithesis of real ones, have provoked Shaw: "What, then, is to be the end of all this revival of staginess? Is the mirror never again to be held up to nature in the theatre?"[3] Staginess cannot be found in his own plays, because, he explains, "I began my own dramatic career by writing plays in which I faithfully held the mirror up to nature."[4]

So too, it is the manager's duty so to handle his casts that he achieve the desired result. And what is achieved when the manager does this is explained by Shaw:

> The success of the Dublin Abbey Street Theatre was due to the fact that, when it began, none of the company was worth twopence a week for ordinary fashionable purposes, though some of them can now hold a London audience in the hollow of their hands. They were held down by Yeats and Lady Gregory ruthlessly to my formula of making the audience believe that real things were happening to real people. They were taught no tricks, because Yeats and Lady Gregory didn't know any, having found out experimentally only what any two people of high intelligence and fine taste could find out by sticking to the point of securing a good representation.[5]

The difficulties involved in trying to hold actors and actresses to this principle are manifest. Managers have an almost insuperable task when confronted with a star cast—stars, Shaw says, are apt to substitute suggestion for "real" acting in an attempt to convince the audience that it is witnessing a magnificent display of acting. Such actors and actresses should be told:

> Mere suggestion is no use here, I don't ask you to suggest anything: I give you the actual things to do and say. I don't want you to look as if you could say wonderful things if you uttered your thoughts: I give you both the thoughts and the words; and you must get them across the footlights.[6]

[2] Shaw, *The Art of Rehearsal*, p. 1.
[3] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. II, p. 92.
[4] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 89.
[5] *The Art of Rehearsal*, p. 4.
[6] *The Art of Rehearsal*, p. 3.

In contrast to stars, "comparatively humble actors, who do not dare to think they can succeed apart from the play, often give much better representations than star casts."[7]

Shaw has emphasized this idea of the "natural" and the "real" in acting in many varied ways. He says that a certain actor, if liberated from a silly costume, "could show the audience what a real man was like—which is the essence of acting."[8] Again, acting is the creation of, "a credible, simple and natural human being."[9] When discussing the difficulty of finding intelligent recruits for the theatre, he says: "most educated women have been trained to fight against emotional expression because it is a mode of self betrayal. Now self betrayal, magnified to suit the optics of the theatre, is the whole art of acting."[10] And:

> You will tell me, no doubt, that Mrs. Patrick Campbell cannot act. Who said she could?—who wants her to act?— . . . On the highest plane one does not act, one *is*. Go and see her move, stand, speak, look, kneel—go and breathe the magic atmosphere that is created by the grace of all of these deeds; and then talk to me about acting, forsooth![11]

If an actor is to be his part, he must be so entirely, which necessitates extraordinary care with his make-up. No one can seem real when adorned with a "'lifeless mask of paint and hair.'"[12] Shaw points with admiration to Duse's refusal to use any make-up. Her facial lines were, in Shaw's estimation, "the credentials of her humanity," and Duse was too wise to "obliterate that significant handwriting beneath a layer of peachbloom from the chemist's."[13]

[7] *The Art of Rehearsal*, p. 2.

[8] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 334.

[9] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. II, p. 253.

[10] *Ibid.* Vol. I, p. 408.

[11] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 363. Compare Constant Coquelin, *Art and the Actor*. He is in accord with this view. Stark Young and Alexander Bakshy, on the other hand, are directly opposed. Stark Young discusses the point in *Theatre Practice*, Ch. I. In *The Theatre Unbound*, Bakshy says: "The actors are merely players not real lovers, fools, kings or witches." (p. 85.) He demands: "Is it necessary in order to believe in a king on the stage to forget at the same time he is only an actor?" (p. 101.) Bakshy has a full discussion of this point.

[12] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 429.

[13] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 136.

The pictorial elements of a stage representation, too, must be consistent with "nature." Shaw resents a costume that is not part of a characterization. Costumes must be clothes worn by people, not dresses chosen by dressmakers to be worn by actresses. Of the all too usual mounting Shaw once remarked that a certain character "looked like a tailor's advertisement making sentimental remarks to a milliner's advertisement in the middle of an upholsterer's and decorator's advertisement."[14]

Previous to realistic staging there reigned that mode of stage setting which Shaw characterized as merely "wings, flats, canvas doors and carpetless boards."[15] He acknowledges that realism brought relief, for one might see on a realistically set stage, "a gentleman who looked like a gentleman walking into a drawing-room that looked like a drawing-room. . . ."[16] Realism alone however will not do, for:

> It is one thing to banish vulgarity and montrosity from the stage and replace them by conventional refinement and scrupulous verisimilitude. It is quite another to surround a real drama with its appropriate atmosphere, and provide a poetic background or an ironically prosaic setting for a tragic scene.[17]

Shaw demands that mounting be both the atmosphere and background which serves to help the actors in carrying out of his formula.

Shaw has been content with merely declaring that the business of the theatre is to be "real": he has set forth a clear method of procedure for directors, has discussed the training of actors, and has even given a tentative glimpse of what he expects of the future theatre.

In writing to an author friend who was about to undertake direction of a long play, Shaw warned:

> Be prepared for a spell of hard work. The incessant strain on one's attention (the actors have their exits and rests; but the producer is hard at it all the time), the social effort of keeping up everyone's spirits in view of a great event, the dry-

[14] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 189.
[15] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 276.
[16] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 277.
[17] *Ibid.* Vol. I, p. 277.

> ness of the previous study of the mechanical details, daunt most authors.[18]

Part of the hard work is the maintaining, by the director, or manager, as Shaw calls him, of a vigilant artistic point of view throughout both preliminary study of the play and the period of rehearsing.

As for casting:

> The artistic manager, as distinguished from the man who merely takes a theatre and puts up a play, is also a critic, and knowing the difference between finished execution and mere larking, picks and drills his company accordingly.[19]

Extreme caution must be exercised, however, for an error in judgment may easily damage a production.[20] Actors ought to be suited to their parts in physical endowment, in personality, in professional power, and in temperament.[21]

Shaw's insistence on good casting has furnished us with a very amusing story. In 1897, when he was about to produce *You Never Can Tell* at the Haymarket Theatre, he chose Cyril Maude to play William, the waiter. Maude says that he was forced to accept "an insignificant part as a mere waiter,"[22] while some one else was engaged for the leading part. Yet many critics are agreed that the part is among Shaw's best characters!

Having chosen his cast, the manager must undergo an arduous period of preparation before he can call them together for the first rehearsal. This preliminary work is indispensable:

> If/before you begin rehearsing you sit down to the manuscript of your play and work out all the stage business; so that you know where every speech is to be spoken as well as what it is to convey, and where the chairs are to be and where they are

[18] The source of the major portion of the content dealing with Shaw's ideas on direction is *The Art of Rehearsal*, an article by Shaw, published by Samuel French.

N. B. These rules of procedure are set down by Shaw for the full length play, but it will be seen that they are readily adaptable to the rehearsing of shorter plays.

[19] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 209.

[20] Compare Frank Vernon, *Modern Stage Production*, pp. 11-12.

[21] For examples of poor casting, cited by Shaw, see *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 52, and Vol. I, p. 188.

[22] Cyril Maude, *The Haymarket Theatre* p. 213.

> to be taken to, and where the actors are to put their hats or anything else they have to take in their hands in the course of the play, and when they are to rise and when they are to sit, and if you arrange all this so as to get the maximum of effect out of every word, and thus make the actors feel that they are speaking at the utmost possible advantage—or at worst that they cannot improve on your business, however little they may like it—and if you take care that they never distract attention from one another; that when they call to one another they are at a due distance; and that, when the audience is looking at one side of the stage and somebody cuts in on the other, some trick (which you must contrive) calls the attention of the audience to the new point of view or hearing, etc., then you will at the first rehearsal get a command of the production that nothing will shake afterward.[23]

Movement, it must be noted, should be dictated by the play and the "real" formula, not by the relative popularity or salary of the members of the cast.[24]

For rehearsals the manager must try to secure substitute properties, of the same dimensions as those to be used in performance. No actor can rehearse sitting down naturally at a table when he is forced to imagine the table. During the rehearsals of the memorable production of *You Never Can Tell*, Cyril Maude, indignantly relates that Shaw,

> insulted the entire profession by wanting a large table on the stage, on the ground that the company would fall over it unless they behaved as if they were coming into a real room instead of, as he coarsely observed, rushing to the float to pick up the band at the beginning of a comic song.[25]

The study ended, the properties secured, the manager may begin rehearsing. At the first meeting he should read the play to the cast, giving them the tone he wants. After which full rehears-

[23] *The Art of Rehearsal*, pp. 4-5. Compare Louis Calvert, a well known actor, who says of a manager that "there must be a certain harmony and smoothness in his relations with the members of his company." *Problems of the Actor*, p. 238.

[24] Shaw was once greatly annoyed by a production of *John Gabriel Borkman*, staged by Frank Vernon. Mr. Vernon tried to give each member of his cast an opportunity for self assertion, to the detriment of the play, in Shaw's opinion. *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. II, p. 247.

[25] Cyril Maude, *The Haymarket Theatre*, Ch. XVI, p. 213. Louis Calvert supports Shaw's demand for substitute properties of exact dimensions. *Problems of the Actor*, Ch. X, p. 196.

als commence, and these fall into three main divisions: the "preliminary" rehearsals, the "perfect" rehearsals, and the "final" ones.

At the first of the "preliminary" rehearsals, the manager should stay on the stage with the cast, giving them all possible help in movement and interpretation. Having put them "through an act for the first time in this way, go through it again to settle the business firmly in their memory."[26] The actors must not be permitted to learn lines, however, until after the first week of rehearsals. Confusion results when an actor tries to remember lines and positions at once. Nor should too much be worked over at once; "one or two acts twice over," Shaw says, are enough during the "preliminary" stage.

Positions being fixed, the cast is ready to enter the second stage of rehearsal. Shaw calls it the "perfect" stage because the actors must be line perfect, i. e., all lines memorized, no scripts used on stage. The manager retires to the auditorium at this point, fortified with a large notebook. And from now on:

> *never interrupt a scene, nor allow anyone else to interrupt it or try back.* When anything goes wrong, or any improvement occurs to you, make a note; and at the end of the act go on the stage and explain your notes to the actors.

It is to be expected that when an actor lays aside his script, and must rely on memory, he becomes ill at ease and uncertain. Shaw warns:

> when the "perfect"' rehearsals begin, the whole affair will collapse in apparent and most disappointing backsliding for at least a week as far as the long parts are concerned, because in the first agony of trying to remember the words everything else will be lost. You must remember that at this stage the actor, being under a heavy strain, is fearfully irritable. But after another week the words will come automatically; and the play will get under way again.

It is at this time that the manager should watch carefully the tone, speed and cues of the production. Actors are prone to take these from one another, instead of from their own parts. This imitation destroys "the continual variety and contrast which are

[26] Unless otherwise noted the cource of all quotations about directing may be found in Shaw's *The Art of Rehearsal.*

the soul of liveliness in comedy and truth in tragedy." Shaw is dogmatic about cues:

> An actor's cue is not a signal to take up the running thoughtlessly, but a provocation to retort or respond in some clearly differentiated way. He must, even on the thousandth night, make the audience believe that he has never heard his cue before.

Such a treatment of cues necessitates acting on the lines. Actors too often hold up a play by inserting all pantomime between the lines. This results in silences, and Shaw says:

> *Never have a moment of silence on the stage except as an intentional stage effect.* The play must not stop while an actor is sitting down or getting up or walking off the stage. The last word of an exit speech must get the actor off the stage. He must sit on a word and rise on a word; if he has to make a movement, he must move as he speaks and not before or after; and the cues must be picked up as smartly as a ball is fielded in cricket. This is the secret of pace, and of holding an audience. It is a rule which you may set aside again and again to make a special effect; for a technical rule may always be broken on purpose.

Star actors and so-called leading men and women are often guilty of this error. The manager can improve his production by giving especial attention to his minor characters. They are more apt to carry out his wishes. There will be a "real" result only when the company works as a harmonious unit.[27]

When the cast is "perfect" and can be depended on to devote its entire attention to acting rather than remembering lines, it is ready for the "final" stage. During the last rehearsals but few notes should have to be taken. At that time the manager

> must watch, watch, watch, like a cat at a mouse hole, and make very well-considered notes. To some of them you will append a "Rehearse this"; and at the end of the act you will ask them to go through the bit to get it right.[28]

[27] Shaw has said that if managers "take care of the minor actors the leading ones will take care of themselves." *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. II, p. 218.

[28] Shaw says that the number of notes taken by a manager during rehearsal varies. As for his own experience: "The first time I ever counted my notes was when I had to produce "Arms and the Man" in ten rehearsals. The total was 600. That is a minimum; I have run into thousands since." *The Art of Rehearsal*, p. 10.

Anyone who has directed a play knows that there are always persons on hand who are eager to suggest this or that change in the performance. They are to be avoided:

> Only geniuses can tell you exactly what is wrong with a scene, though plenty of people can tell you that there is something wrong with it. So make a note of their dissatisfaction; but be very careful how you adopt their cure if they prescribe one. For instance, if they say a scene is too slow (meaning that it bores them), the remedy in nine cases out of ten is for the actors to go slower and bring out the meaning better by contrasts of tone and speed.

Shaw's experience revealed many pitfalls which managers must avoid. His cautions and hints are numerous, and it seems wise to give them in tabulated form:

> 1. Don't criticize. If a thing is wrong and you don't know exactly how to set it right, say nothing. Wait until you find out the right thing to do, or until the actor does. It discourages and maddens an actor to be told merely that you are dissatisfied. If you cannot help him, let him alone. Tell him what to do if you know: if not, hold your tongue until it comes to you or to him, as it probably will if you wait.
> 2. If you get angry, and complain that you have repeatedly called attention, etc., like a schoolmaster, you will destroy the whole atmosphere in which art breaths, and make a scene which is not in the play, and a very disagreeable and invariably unsuccessful scene at that.
> 3. [Having asked an actor to improve a bit][29], *don't* say when it doesn't come right: "We must go on at this until we get it, if we have to stay here all night:" the schoolmaster again. If it goes wrong, it will go wronger with every repetition on the same day. Leave it until next time.
> 4. Remember (particularly during the irritable stage) that you must not tell an actor too much all at once. Not more than two or three important things can be borne at one rehearsal; and *don't* mention trifles, such as slips in business or in words, in a heart-broken desperate way, as if the world were crumbling in ruins. Don't mention anything that doesn't really matter. Be prepared for the same mistake being repeated time after time, and your directions being forgotten until you have given them three or four days running.
> 5. Do not forget that though at the first rehearsal you will know more about the parts than the actors, at the last rehearsal they ough to know more about them (through their

[29] The words enclosed within brackets are ours.

undivided attention) than you, and therefore have something to teach you about them.

6. Remember that no strangers should be present at a rehearsal. It is sometimes expedient that strangers, and even journalists, be invited to witness a so-called rehearsal; and on such occasions a prearranged interruption by the producer may take place to affirm the fact that the occasion is only a rehearsal. But the interruption must be addressed to the mechanical staff about some mechanical detail. No direction should ever be given to an actor in the presence of a stranger; and the consent of every actor should be obtained before a stranger is admitted. The actor, of course, is bound to the same reticence. A stranger is a non-professional who is not in the theatre on business. Rehearsals are absolutely and sacredly confidential. The publication of gossip about rehearsals, or the disclosure of the plot of a play, is the blackest breach of stage etiquette.[30]

So we see that white Shaw would have the actor treated well, he would also hope to give managers more skilled actors to work with; for acting is the "most incompetent profession in the world."[31] This incompetence is due in part to the haphazard ways in which persons enter the profession, and in part to the still more haphazard manner in which they are trained.

Shaw feels that intelligence and imagination rather than physical attractiveness and personality should be a prerequisite for admission to the profession. Good looking men and pretty women are usually cast, to be sure, since up to a certain point any one can act, and they continue to be cast, probably on their looks alone—popularity has been attained this way[32]—but the incompetent profession needs recruits with intelligence, imagination and an artis-

[30] It is exceedingly difficult to find accounts of Shaw as manager. Cyril Maude's version of the *You Never Can Tell* production would seem to indicate that Shaw was lacking in the tact and patience he demands of managers. Ellen Terry, however, refutes Maude's opinion, "I found Bernard Shaw wonderfully patient at rehearsal. I look upon him as a good, kind, gentle creature whose 'brain-storms' are just due to the Irishman's love of a fight; they never spring from malice or anger. It doesn't answer to take Bernard Shaw seriously." *The Story of My Life*, p. 347.

[31] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 198.

[32] Shaw has said of Eleonora Duse, who was not beautiful, that she was "helped to her supremacy by the fortunate sternness of Nature in giving her nothing but her genius. . . . Duse without her genius would be

tic conscience. The most important of these qualities, doubtless, is an artistic conscience, for even though it is dormant when the novice begins training, it must be present if he is to become a good actor; the ability to distinguish between a harsh tone and a fine one, to tell an awkward movement from a graceful one, can carry an actor to the top of his profession. The top cannot be reached over night, however. Granted these qualifications the recruit must be willing to work ceaselessly to gain the technique necessary for good acting. Shaw estimates that the young man who "is prepared for a hard apprenticeship of twenty years in mastering the art of the stage—for that period still holds as good as when Talma prescribed it—can become an actor if he likes."[33]

The incompetence of actors is not wholly to be blamed on their indolence. The theatre does not offer recruits a system of apprenticeship or any organized system of training.[34] Consequently many beginners ignore or underestimate the importance of technical proficiency in acting. This makes Shaw impatient:

> Actors, it seems to me, will not be persuaded nowadays to begin at the right end of their profession. Instead of acquiring the cultivated speech, gesture, movement, and personality which distinguish acting as a fine art from acting in the ordinary sense in which everybody acts, they dismiss it as a mere word which signifies to be, to do, or to suffer. . . .[35]

Granted there are some earnest recruits desirous of training, where can they find it? In stock companies? In touring companies? In long runs? In repertory? Shaw finds little good in any of these "schools" except perhaps in the last named. Some sound training

a plain little woman of no use to any manager . . . *with* her genius, is so fascinating that it is positively difficult to attend to the play instead of attending wholly to her. *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 131.

[33] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 114.

It is in his *Reflexions on Acting* that Talma urges the actor to adopt a course of study for himself, and says the study requires at least twenty years. pp. 22-23.

[34] In this connection Shaw says: "The theatre is unable to keep and drill able-bodied and able-minded recruits; and the result is that the class of work which would in any other profession be perfectly within the competence of the rank and file, has to be entrusted to the leaders. And even the leaders are often more remarkable for what is called social charm than for any rarer artistic qualification." *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 408.

[35] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 46.

may be found in each, but in all it is interspersed with too many unsound methods. The earnest learners must shift for themselves, seeking the sound training here and there; unless they are fortunate enough to be able to affiliate with a well organized repertory group.

There are many champions of the stock company who insist that its training developed versatility. One had to learn to sing, to dance, and fence as well as act, and to be ready to do any of these on short notice. Shaw categorically denies this; he declares that the stock trained actor is: "the least versatile of beings;"[36] stock forced him to adopt a "line:"

> for example, if his "line" was old age, he acquired a trick of doddering and speaking in a cracked voice: if juvenility, he swaggered and effervesced. With these accomplishments, eked out by a few rules of thumb, as to wigs and face-painting, one deplorable step dance, and one still more deplorable "combat," he "swallowed" every part given to him in a couple of hours, and regurgitated it in the evening over the footlights, always in the same manner, however finely the dramatist might have individualised it.[37]

Touring, on the other hand, is not a whit better than stock. Actors who spend years "on tour" are restricted to "parts that involve nothing but a little business thoughtlessly copied from the performances of their London 'creators,' with long intervals spent between each tour in the ranks of the unemployed.[38] They are not likely to improve their skill in these intervals, but instead spend their time hoping chance will give them an opportunity which they are not prepared to fill.

Long runs, Shaw grants, offer slightly better changes of training than stock and touring afford. During the run an actor may vary and develop all the possibilities of his part "before it exhausts him."[39] At least the opportunity for growth is at hand.

Shaw places faith in repertory. He considers stock and long runs at opposite poles with repertory between them:

> Take the case of the great Italian actors who have visited us, and whose acting is of an excellence apparently quite beyond

[36] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 268.
[37] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. II, pp. 389-390.
[38] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 267.
[39] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 390.

> the reach of our best English performers. We find them extremely chary of playing every night. They have a repertory containing plays which count as resting places for them. For example, Duse relieves Magda with Mirandolina just as our own Shakespearean star actors used to relieve Richard the Third and Othello with Charles Surface and Don Felix. But even with this mitigation no actor can possibly play leading parts of the first order six nights a week all the year round unless he underplays them, or routines them mechanically in the old stock manner, or faces a terrible risk of disablement by paralysis, or, finally, resorts to alcohol or morphia, with the usual penalties. What we want in order to get the best work is a repertory theatre with alternative casts.[40]

However it may be obtained, training is absolutely essential. The young actor must develop technical skill and an artistic sense, no matter how he does it. He must be able to say that his voice and body are so trained that:

> Within the limits imposed by my age and sex, I can do all the ordinary work of the stage with perfect certainty. I know my vowels and consonants as a phonetic expert, and speak so as to arrest the attention of the audience whenever I open my mouth, forcibly, delicately, roughly, smoothly, pretilly, harshly, authoritatively, submissively, but always artistically, just as you want it. I can sit, stand, fall, get up, walk, dance and otherwise use my body with the complete command of it that marks the physical artist.[41]

Shaw considers an actor's voice of such importance that he once told John Barrymore that an actor "must do nine-tenths of his acting with his voice."[42] Obviously a voice which must undergo such constant use must be free from any disagreeableness, it must have excellent carrying power, and great flexibility. It must, above all, be a "cultivated natural voice instead of an acquired artificial one."[43]

[40] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. II, pp. 390-391. Compare Mrs. Fiske's diametrically opposed opinion. She says that the repertory idea is an "outworn, needless, impossible, *harmful* scheme." See Alexander Woollcott, *Mrs. Fiske*, Ch. II, "An Assault on the Repertory Idea."

[41] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 425.

[42] Letter from Shaw to John Barrymore, published in *The Ladies Home Journal*, February, 1926.

[43] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 291.

Obviously the theatre cannot tolerate faulty articulation,[44] "slipshod carelessness of speech,"[45] and the recruit must avoid any possibility of using such speech by studying the sounds of the language i. e., phonetics. He must cultivate, as well, a high standard of diction. Shaw feels that the actor should beware of stage usage:

> It seems to me that actors and actresses never dream nowadays of learning to speak. What they do is this. Since in their raw native state they are usually quite out of the question as plausible representatives of those galaxies of rank and fashion, the *dramatis personae* of our smart plays, and having no idea that the simple remedy is to learn the alphabet over again and learn it correctly, they take great pains to parrot a detestable convention of "smart" talking, supposed to represent refined speech by themselves and that huge majority of their audience which knows no better, but actually a caricature of the affectations of the parvenu and the "outsider."... The vulgarity of this convention is innocent compared to its unbearable monotony, fatal to that individuality without which no actor can interest an audience. All countries and districts send us parliamentary speakers who have cultivated the qualities of their native dialect and corrected its faults whilst aiming at something like a standard purity and clearness of speech. Take Mr. Gladstone for instance. For his purposes as an orator he has studied his speech as carefully and with as great powers of application as any actor. But he has never lost, and never wanted to lose certain features of his speech which stamp him as a Northcountryman. When Mr. T. P. O'Connor delivers a speech, he does not inflict on us the vulgarities of Beggar's Bush; but he preserves for us all the music of Galway, though he does not say "Yis" for "Yes" like a Galway peasant any more than he says "Now" (Nah-oo) for "No" like a would-be smart London actor. It is so with all good speakers off the stage. Among good speakers the Irishman speaks like an Irishman, the Scotchman like a Scotchman, the American like an American, and so on. It should be so on the stage also, both in classical plays and representations of modern society, though of course it is the actor's business to assume dialects and drop or change them at will in character parts, and to be something of a

[44] Shaw's practice has proved his eagerness for clear-cut articulation. We find that it was due to him "that actors have spoken with perfect distinctness in the performance of his plays. Few plays have been so well 'spoken' as Mr. Shaw's." Editorial Notes, "The Londoner," section on "Mr. Shaw and Pure English," in the *Bookman*, August, 1924.

[45] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 203.

> virtuoso in speech in all parts. A very moderate degree of accomplishment in this direction would make an end of stage smart speech, which, like the got-up Oxford and drawl of a foolish curate, is the mark of a snob.[46]

The novice has further to learn proper delivery, which goes hand in hand with a good voice and good articulation. All too often actors substitute howling, ranting,[47] and intoning[48] for fine delivery. These tricks will spoil the delivery of prose; they will assuredly ruin the delivery of verse, and all actors should be capable of reading verse. But the actor must be careful in selecting a tutor for delivery. Many will offer to teach him, but his best course is to wait until he has command of English sounds, "then leave blank verse patiently alone until [he has] experienced emotion deep enough to crave for poetic expression, at which point verse will seem an absolutely natural and real form of speech."[49]

The beginner must also avoid bad habits in body work. He must learn to move freely, to look "alive all over."[50] He must be sure not to drape himself against furniture and to pose each attitude. Posing, as an end in itself, is spoiled as soon as the audience becomes conscious of the pose. For this reason Shaw once said of a young actress: "Every movement ended in a picture.... But that is not acting. It is a string that a finished actress may add to her bow if she has the faculty for it... but as a changeling for acting it will not do."[51]

Once having mastered the foregoing principles, the young actor must learn how to select and make points. This Shaw con-

[46] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. II, pp. 240, 241, 242.

[47] Apropos of ranting: "Ranting is not, as it is generally assumed to be, bad acting. It is not acting at all, but the introduction of an exhibition of force for the sake of force." *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 150.

[48] Bernhardt intoned, and elicited this criticism from Shaw: "Of course, intoning is easy—as easy as holding down one key of an accordian and keeping up a mellifluous smile all the time; but it dehumanizes speech, and after some minutes becomes maddening, so that a flash of fun or a burst of rage is doubly welcome because it for a moment alters that eternal pitch and timbre. Some critics speak of the 'melody' of it, as to which I can only say that the man who finds melody in one sustained note would find exquisite curves in a packing case."
Ibid., Vol. I, p. 152.

[49] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 27.

[50] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 335.

[51] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 311.

siders such an important phase of training, that he even classifies acting according to the actors' or actresses' ability to make points:

> You offer a part to a young lady who is an enthusiastic beginner. She reads it devoutly, and forms, say, half a dozen great ideas as to points which she will make. The difficulty then is to induce her to do nothing between these points; so that the play may be allowed at such moments to play itself. Probably when it comes to the point, these intervals will prove the only effective periods during her performance, the points being ill chosen or awkwardly executed. The majority of actresses never get beyond learning not to invent new points for themselves, but rather to pick out in their parts the passages which admit of certain well worn and tried old points being reapplied. When they have learnt to make these points smoothly and to keep quiet between whiles with a graceful air of having good reasons for doing nothing, they are finished actresses. The great actress has a harder struggle. She goes on inventing her points and her business determinedly, constantly increasing the original half-dozen, and constantly executing them with greater force and smoothness. A time comes when she is always making points, and making them well; and this is the finishing point with some actresses. But with the greatest artists there soon commences an integration of the points into a continuous whole, at which stage the actress appears to make no points at all, and to proceed in the most unstudied and "natural" way.[52]

Of course an actor might easily play each part by merely selecting the points he should make and relying on his technical skill to put these points across. This might prove effective but it will not be the interpretation of a "real" person. Such a rendering is only a display of technical ability, which an actor may have,

[52] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, p. 132. Shaw adds: "This rare consummation Duse has reached. An attentive study of her Marguerite Gauthier, for instance, by a highly trained observer of such things, will bring to light how its apparently simple strokes are combinations of a whole series of strokes, separately conceived originally, and added one by one to the part, until finally, after many years of evolution, they have integrated into one complex stroke. . . . There are years of work, bodily and mental, behind every instant of it—work, mind, not mere practise and habit, which is quite a different thing. It is the rarity of the gigantic energy needed to sustain this work which makes Duse so exceptional." *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 133.

> and yet, for want of the power to interpret an author's text and invent the appropriate expression for it, never, without coaching, get beyond Rosencrantz or Seyton. It is, therefore, only the minimum qualification of a skilled stage hand; and if an actor is not that, then he is merely a stage-struck unskilled laborer or handy man and his "conceptions" of Ibsen or Shakespeare are mere impertinences.[53]

For the finest interpretation, then, the actor must learn the playwrights's intent;[54] he must understand the character he is to portray; his relation to the theme of the play, and to the other characters in the play; the environment which has created that character and the emotions experienced by the character. When he discovers all this, he must translate it into terms of people,[55] and thereby create a "real" character.

Even greater than technical competence and interpretative power, however, is the fully developed artistic conscience. Shaw readily acknowledges that great difficulty is experienced in developing this:

> Now, the power of complying with artistic conditions without being so preoccupied by them as to be incapable of thinking of anything else is hard to acquire, and can be perfected only by long practise.... The habit can never become as instinctive as keeping one's balance, for instance, because failure in that for even an instant means a fall, so that the practise in it is lifelong and constant; whereas the artistic habit lapses more or less in the absence of audience, and even on the stage can be forgotten for long periods without any worse consequences than a loss of charm which nothing may bring to the actor's attention. The real safeguard against such lapses is a sense of beauty—the artistic sense—cultivated to such a degree of sensitiveness that a coarse or prosaic tone, or an awkward gesture, jars instantly on the artist as a note out of tune jars on a musician. The defect of the old-fashioned systems of training for the stage was that they attempted to prescribe the conclusions of this constantly evolving artistic

[53] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, pp. 425-426.

[54] Compare Louis Calvert: "We should have some notion of the entire play, before we begin the study of our own part." *Problems of the Actor*, p. 63.

[55] Shaw once wrote to Miss Janet Achurch, that for the proper interpretation of Lady Cicely in *Captain Brassbound's Conversion*, she should study the English lady from life. Letter published in *The Theatre Arts Monthly*, January, 1928.

> sense instead of cultivating it and leaving the artist to its guidance. Thus they taught you an old-fashioned stage-walk, an old-fashioned stage voice, an old-fashioned stage way of kneeling, of sitting down, of shaking hands, of picking up a handkerchief, and so on, each of them supposed to be the final and perfect way of doing it. The end of that was, of course, to discredit training altogether. But neglect of training very quickly discredits itself; and it will now perhaps be admitted that the awakening and culture of the artistic conscience is a real service which a teacher can render to an actor. When that conscience is thoroughly awakened and cultivated, when a person can maintain vigilant artistic sensitiveness throughout a performance whilst making all the movements required by the action of a drama, and speaking all its dialogue graphically without preoccupation or embarrassment, then that person is a technically competent artistic actor, able to play a part of which he hardly comprehends one line, in a play of which he knows nothing except his own words and speeches and the cues thereto, much more intelligibly and effectively, as well as agreeably, than a statesman with ten times his general ability could.[56]

This is a high artistic standard, discoverable, probably, in ideal actors. Only they are not to be had, nor are ideal plays and ideal playhouses. But if we do not have ideal plays and playhouses we do have new ones occasionally in the ever changing theatre, and Shaw sees us approaching both in the near future.

Our new plays, Shaw thinks, will be written from an old pattern—that used by Shakespeare. This form presents:

> The story told with utter disregard of the unity of place in a rapid succession of scenes, practically unlimited in number, uninterrupted by waits and just as short or as long as their dramatic interest can bear.[57]

This old-new dramatic form will necessitate new playhouses:

> No theatre is likely to be generally useful in the future unless its stage is so constructed that it can present a play in fifty scenes without a break. I do not mean that there should be no break, as fifty scenes might be too much for the endurance of the audience; but I do mean that the suspension of the performance for ten minutes or so should be solely for the

[56] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. I, pp. 205, 206, 207.

[57] Unless otherwise noted the source of all quotations about the new theatre may be found in an article by Shaw entitled: "Wanted: A New Sort of Theatre," *Theatre Magazine*, May, 1925.

> relief of the spectators and not a mechanical necessity. If I am right, most of our existing theatres will become unlettable as playhouses. I hope they will; the sooner the better.

The future playhouses must be such that the "audience is comfortable and obscure and the stage blazingly conspicuous."

Comfort for spectators is a novel idea in theatre construction for Shaw reminds us that "there is a tradition of discomfort in the theatre," dating from Shakespeare's time. The nineteenth century left "our cities stuffed with pestiferous playgoer barrels in which the unfortunate playwrights and actors were expected by sheer force of entertaining power to set up an attraction that would counter-balance the greatest discomfort of the greatest number."

Although the audience must be comfortable, it must be obscure at the same time. The theatre must not encourage those who attend its performances merely for self display. In the usual nineteenth century playhouse, "The important spectacle was the evening dress and diamonds of the actor manager's free list."[58] Wagner's Bayreuth Festival Playhouse differed from others in this respect:

> Unlike our opera houses, which are constructed so that the audience may present a splendid pageant to the delighted manager, it is designed to secure an uninterrupted view of the stage, and an undisturbed hearing of the music, to the audience.[59]

The "all dominating" stage is the most important feature of the new theatre described by Shaw. This completely rules out the present "mere hole in the wall at the narrow end, though which you peeped at a remote *tableau vivant* resembling a pictorial advertisement of the best rooms in the latest hotel." The auditorium, rather:

> must combine the optics and acoustics of a first-rate lecture theatre and a first-rate circus. There must be a fore-stage extending on occasion to the occupation of all the floor level (what is called the ring in an equestrian circus) and the back-

[58] Duse once said, "The drama dies of stalls and boxes and evening dress, and people who come to digest their dinner." Arthur Symons, *Eleanora Duse*, p. 3.

[59] Shaw, *The Perfect Wagnerite*, p. 145.

> stage must be easily curtained off and provided with modern machinery capable of doing its work noiselessly whilst the play is proceeding on the fore-stage.[60]

Shaw has approved of a large fore-stage for a long time. It was many years ago he said after viewing some performances of the Elizabethan Stage Society, "any play performed on a platform amidst the audience gets closer home to its hearers than when it is presented as a picture framed by a proscenium.[61]

The new theatre should have not only modern machinery, but also lighting which "should be modern and if possible planned by persons who have never seen footlights and wonder what on earth they can have been when they read about them in books. . . ." But neither machinery nor lighting should be used as an end in itself in the new theatre. It must not be supposed, Shaw says, that "playing about with the latest lighting systems and showing what hydraulic lifts can do, will interest any audience more than the first half-minute."

The managers of the theatres of the future must remember that "we are less conscious of the artificialities of the stage when a few well-understood conventions, adroitly handled, are substituted for attempts at an impossible scenic verismilitude.[62] After all it is quite likely that "the old formula of two trestles, four boards and a passion still holds and will hold until we grow out of playgoing altogether."

[60] Compare the foregoing with the discussion of Max Reinhardt's abandonment of the proscenium, in Herr Arthur Kahane's *The Theatre of the Five Thousand;* "Many things that appear to most people to be inseparable from the theatre are being discarded. No curtain separates stage and auditorium. On entering the theatre the spectator feels and is impressed by the possibilities of space, and the essential mood is created in him to be preserved after the piece has begun. No small, strongly circumscribed, impassable frame separates the world of the play from the outer world, and the action flows freely through the whole of the theatre. The peep-show character of the "scene," which was known, neither to the stage of the ancients, nor to the Shakespearean stage, nor to the Molièrean stage, and which to people of a conservative frame of mind is still the highest point of theatrical art, simply because they are not aware that they merely worship a fossilised fragment of Italian Opera and Ballet tradition, has vanished: Huntly Carter, *The Theatre of Max Reinhardt*, p. 123.

[61] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. II, p. 40.

[62] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, Vol. II, pp. 40-41.

THE CONTENTS OF A HIGH-SCHOOL COURSE IN SPEECH[1]

ALICE EVELYN CRAIG
The Polytechnic High School, Los Angeles

THE Contents of a High-School Course in Speech is an exceedingly broad subject and admits of many angles of consideration. It would be extremely difficult to map out a speech course adaptable to every situation and condition, to every school, small or large, technical or academic, and to every group of schools. I shall endeavor to outline a course that by some persons may be regarded as utopian; by others it may be deemed thoroughly practical. In fact, it is based in great part upon the course in speech as at present in operation at the Polytechnic High School in Los Angeles, California.

If a high school is in the process of formation, the obstacles confronting the installation of a consecutive and complete course would be negligible, and the fine interrelation of speech activities and regular recitations would at once be established. If the high-school course is fully established, numerous adjustments in the curriculum would have to be consummated. In a technical school, the instructors of vocational subjects usually demand the greater portion of the school program for the subjects under their jurisdiction; in the academic departments, teachers of regular English are loathe to surrender any portion of time heretofore given to the study of formal grammar and to the literary classics. Furthermore, the taxpayers look askance at the introduction of any new or different material into the course of study that seems to threaten unnecessary or additional expenditure of school funds. But if a course similar to the one about to be described were adopted with the necessary adjustments in school organization, there would accrue incomputable benefits to the school community. The teachers of the technical subjects would come to the inevitable conclusion that they had not lost but gained by the readjustment, since their students would have become far more efficient in their application of these particular subjects; the teachers of regular English

[1] An Address Delivered at the December, 1929, Convention of The National Association of the Teachers of Speech.

would find that the interest of their students both in grammar and in the classics had become considerably livened and far more appreciative; and the taxpayers would discover that they had saved thousands of dollars, inasmuch as innumerable students, formerly failing because of lack of courage to recite, or of inability to cull the meaning of the paragraphs from the printed page, had passed their grades. Moreover, the school authorities would find that due to the establishment of natural ways of self-expression many of the usual disciplinary problems had been solved.

An ideal course in speech would be recurrent in presentation; that is, there would be a progressive arrangement whereby the students should be required to take work in some form of speech every third semester; for instance, in the B 8th grade of the junior high school; in the B 10th grade of the senior high school; and again, in the B 12th grade. These three required grades of work necessarily may have utilitarian purposes that are alike, but the scope, the content, the method of presentation, and, in so far as possible, the accompanying nomenclature, should be totally different.

Supplemental to these required courses there should be elective speech art courses for those who show exceptional aptitude for the work, or who intend making some form of speech their vocation. These classes would probably be offered under the titles *Interpretation, Dramatics,* and *Public Address.*

Also, there should be remedial classes for those who need special help in order that they may attain the standard in speech activities.

Each phase of the work, especially that embraced in the required course, should be definitely mapped out and executed. There should be some flexibility in the course to permit the working out of the individual ideas by the resourceful and inventive teacher, but in order that there may be no justification for the remark sometimes heard that the speech course is a "snap," the work should be both intensive and extensive. Efficient articulation of the several courses, and carefully planned daily work would insure for both the individual student and the school at large definite results at the several stages of progress.

Before I go into detail regarding the content of a high-school course in speech, may I state that it is my earnest conviction that

in the elementary grades the subject of speech, including diction, reading, and educational dramatics, should be placed under the advisement of a supervisor. Every day we are discovering effort-saving devices and short-cut methods in the processes needful for the breaking up of inhibitions and limitations in self-expression, and the right kind of a supervisor could save the school department many hours and much uselessly expended effort by bringing to the notice of the individual teachers in charge of elementary grades these technical, although many times simple, suggestions and helps. Furthermore, the students would come to us in the high schools far better prepared if the work were articulated with uniformity from the kindergarten through the elementary grades. Naturally teachers concentrate their efforts upon work that is supervised, and if the attention were focussed upon speech, especially diction, the ensuing results would be felt in every phase of school routine and activities.

REQUIRED COURSES

B 8th grade of the Junior High School

The course in speech in the B 8th grade of the junior high school would naturally be the division of the work which aims for the inculcation of correct speech habits and for the establishment of simple but accurate mental processes in relation to speech activities. The first few days of the work would necessarily be taken up with an inventory of the ground covered in the previous grades. For instance, in this review every student should be tested individually rearding his pronunciation and enunciation of such sounds as: *wh* in words beginning with that sound, *rd* in the word absurd, and *rb* in the word absorb, and the final *g* in words ending with the suffix *ing*. Common errors of diction should be thoroughly checked off at this junction before the student is allowed to advance further in his educational career and his habits of speech shall have become fixed.

The general plan of the work of this grade would naturally divide itself into daily exercises and drills, platform talks, readings, rudimentary parliamentary practice, and beginning dramatics.

The ten minute drill in the use of correct diction would necessarily include exercises in full, diaphragmatic, and rhythmical breathing; exercises for the establishment of correct sitting and

standing positions; and, exercises for the development of the speech vocabulary.

The platform talks, two sets of which should be given per week, would best be founded upon the observation and experience of the student. Among the interesting general subjects from which the students of this grade could deduce individual speech topics are the following: *My Favorite Book, My Favorite Game, How I Earned My First Dollar, My Experiences with the Radio, The Best Motion Picture I Have Ever Seen.* Then proceeding from the known to the unknown, the students may well give talks upon topics that demand a little exploration into the field of reference; among the general subjects offering opportunities for a wide selection of individual topics demanding research are: *Electrical Appliances, Aviation, Heroes and Heroines of Today, South America, The American Flag.*

Since the reading phase of the work would consist of the analysis and application of mental processes involved in reading, the students should be aroused to think and to imagine as well as to pause, to phrase, and to emphasize. Regulation of the tempo to suit both the occasion and the type of reading is an important accomplishment for the oral reader at this period of development. For the application of the technique of reading, a compilation of excerpts from masterpieces of literature is better for purposes of establishing good habits of reading than is a book composed of full-length stories and long accounts of happenings.

Dramatics for this grade should comprise the rudiments of acting technique, some insight into the intricacies of play production, and the class-room dramatization of short scenes from Shakespeare. There are two textbooks available today which furnish excellent cuttings from those of Shakespeare's plays adapted to school-room use. This phase of the work should be offered more for purposes of dramatic appreciation than for the development of the art of acting.

B 10th grade

A COURSE IN SPEECH FUNDAMENTALS AND PLATFORM SPEAKING

The general plan of the work for the B 10th grade of the senior high school would naturally include exercises in the fundamentals of speech, oral reading, elementary debate, and educa-

tional dramatics. I shall sketch in detail this phase of the course as followed in the Polytechnic High School of Los Angeles. It is well at this point of growth to formulate more or less definitely the aims of a speech course. Also, it will be found that the advancement of the individual student is more decisive, and the immediate results better apparent, when the work is definitely arranged by weeks and days.

AIMS

1. To develop in *character:* self-confidence, initiative, poise, individuality
2. To develop in *manner of expression:* spontaneity, ease and freedom, simplicity and sincerity, directness
3. To establish correct *conditions for speech:* ease and relaxation, poise and position, diaphragmatic and full breathing
4. To establish good *habits of speech:* distinct enunciation, correct pronunciation, adequate volume of voice
5. To develop certain *mental faculties* in relation to speech: observation, imagination, memory, reasoning
6. To develop the *powers of marsnalling and correlating ideas*
7. To develop *community interests* through (1) listening to others, (2) interchange of ideas, and (3) discussion of topics of civic and national importance

GENERAL PLAN OF ASSIGNMENTS

First five weeks: Exercises in fundamentals, vocabulary-building, outline-making, platform talks

General suggestions for daily plan

Monday: Exercises and vocabulary-building
Tuesday: Platform talks by first section of class
Wednesday: Platform talks by second section of class
Thursday: Pantomimes
Friday: Round-table discussions

Note 1: Talks should be limited to three or four minutes according to the size of the class.

Note 2: In order that students may be given opportunity to talk from the platform as frequently as possible, the teacher may find it advisable to write her Constructive Criticisms in the student's notebook as he is talking from the platform. The following arrangement of headings, written with adequate spacing by the student on a page accompanying the outline, may be used to advantage:

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM

1. *References:*
2. *Outline:*
3. *Ideas:*

4. *English:*
5. *Delivery:*

Note 3: If one day of the week is reserved for other work, such as the making up of delayed speeches, or for private criticism of the students, the pantomimes and round-table discussions may be presented on alternate weeks.

1st week

Exercises: For spontaneity

Talks: Set of topics, *Things We Have Made* or *Games*

Round-table discussions: Timely topics promotive of independent thinking

Note: The students may serve in rotation as chairmen.

2nd week

Exercises: For poise and position, outline-making, preliminary practice for platform talks

Talks: Set of topics, Animals: *Their Homes and Habits* or *Air, Land and Sea*

Round-table discussions: Topics of timely interest

3rd week

Exercises: Vocabulary-building (assigned words)

Note: After the first recitation, which may serve as a model or typical recitation, this phase of work should occupy approximately but five minutes for the entire class.

Talks: Set of topics, *Contemporary Men and Women of Achievement*

Pantomimes: General subject from which individual pantomimes may be selected, *Out-of-door pantomimes*

Note: Students should make outlines of pantomimes using the words *Entrance* for Introduction, *Action* for Development, and *Exit* for Conclusion.

4th week

Exercises: Vocabulary-building (new words); diction, especially pronunciation

Talks: Set of topics, *Chart and Chalk Talks* or *Vocations*

Round-table discussions: Timely topics

5th week

Exercises: Vocabulary building (new words): diction, especially prounciation with use of diacritical markings

Talks: Set of topics, *Seeing America First*

Pantomimes: General subject from which may be chosen individual topics for pantomimes, *Occupations*

Second five weeks: Exercises in speech fundamentals, reading, story-telling

Suggestions for daily plan

Monday: Exercises in speech fundamentals

Tuesday: Reading exercises

Wednesday: Readings
Thursday: Readings
Friday: Readings

6th week

Exercises: Review of diacritical markings

Reading exercises: For word-illumination, using excerpts from literary masterpieces for practice

Readings: From a book of short stories such as Davis and Getchell, *Stories of the Day's Work*

Note 1: Each student should read aloud before the class at least twice a week.

Note 2: For constructive criticisms of reading the following arrangement of headings, written with adequate spacing by the student in his notebook and handed to the instructor before the student mounts the platform, may be used to advantage:

Constructive Criticisms of Reading

1. *Thought:*
2. *Position and gesture:*
3. *Voice:*
4. *Natural methods of interpretation including phrasing, pausing, emphasizing and subordinating:*
5. *Characterization:*
6. *Platform deportment:*
7. *Relation with the audience:*

7th week

Exercises: for diction, especially enunciation

Reading exercises: Methods of natural or conversational reading with excerpts from literary masterpieces used for practice

Readings: From a book of short stories

8th week

Exercises: For distinct enunciation

Platform reading technique

Readings: From a book of short stories

9th week

Exercises: For flexibility of tones

Story-telling technique

Story-telling: Based upon *The Classic Myths*, or upon some recently published book of biographies as Hyde, *Modern Biographies*

10th week

Exercises: For quality of tones, directness, and volume of voice

Story-telling: Continuation of work in 9th week

11th week

Parliamentary law presented according to definite progressive steps, such as the introduction of business, presentation of a

motion, the rules of debate, presentation of the several forms of amendment, methods of voting, precedence of motions, order of business, and duties of the several officers

12th week

Parliamentary law with consideration of the several steps involved in the organizations of a society or club; parliamentary practice

13th week

Elementary debate

Suggestions for daily plan

Monday: Elementary debate technique

Tuesday: A composite debate upon a selected question, each student preparing and giving before the class a definite portion of a debate

Wednesday: Assignments of questions and sides for the debates to be held the following week; appointment of chairmen for the various debates and selection of judges with directions for computing the decision

Thursday: Rehearsals for debate forms

Friday: Submission of written briefs to instructor for corrections and suggestions

14th week

Debates by the class in groups of four or six as the size of the class may demand.

15th week

A continuation of the work apportioned for the 14th week

Fourth five weeks: Study and oral interpretation of a Shakespearian play: summarizing talks

16th week: Appreciative study of a Shakespearian play

Note: The work of the B 8th grade and of the B 10th grade should be so well articulated that there is no duplication of the classic plays read and interpreted in the two sections of school work. If *Julius Caesar* is selected for the B 8th grade, *As You Like It* or *The Midsummer Night's Dream* may be chosen for the B 10th grade.

17th week: A continuation of work apportioned to the 16th week

18th week: Oral interpretation of scenes from the Shakespearian play

19th week: A continuation of work apportioned to the 18th week

20th week: Talks summarizing the results of the entire ground covered in the work of the semester

B 11th and A 11th Grades: EXPRESSION

In a model course in speech, the work would be continual in some form. At the Polytechnic High School in Los Angeles, the

students gain further practice in platform speech during the eleventh grade by taking part in some variety of expression once a week for the twenty weeks; these classes are offered under the captions *Conversation, Current Events, Parliamentary Law, Open Forum,* and *Drama Appreciation.* This arrangement is made possible because of a state ruling that every student in the secondary grades must have physical education two whole hours during the week, and the authorities of the school in computing the time have found that one full period may thus be allotted to other work; in the tenth grade this period is given over to the several forms of expression. The students are required to take this work but no graduation credit is given.

B12th Grade: A COURSE IN SPEECH TYPES

As a preparation either for a business life to commence immediately at the close of the high-school course, or for a university career, a course in the presentation of original speech types, and the oral interpretation of literature types, should be required of all pre-graduates of a senior high school. This phase of the work serves as both a finishing course and a preparatory course; a finishing course, in that it offers opportunity for the final eradication of flagrant faults of diction and the conclusive establishment of facility in self-expression upon semi-public occasions; and a preparatory course, in that it serves to prepare the students for effective impartation of special topics, the method that comprises a great part of the work in advanced educational institutions.

The purposes of this work, and the general plan by weeks and days, may seem to be very similar to the objectives and plan of the work offered in the B 10th grade; but, because of differences in both the content of the work and the method of attack, the aims would be intrinsically different. The topics for the speeches naturally would be of a more abstract nature; the reference work would be more extensive and involved, the technique demanded in both the forming and delivery of the speeches would be stressed more in detail; the open-forum method of discussion would take the place of the round-table discussion, and the mental processes brought into play in oral reading would be more clearly understood and established. All in all, the advanced course would be of a more formal nature and would approach more clearly a full speech arts course.

The arrangement or work by weeks may be mainly as follows:

First five weeks: Speeches from the platform
Second five weeks: Interpretative readings
Third five weeks: Debate and speeches for special occasions
Fourth five weeks: Class-room dramatics

The assignments according to days may be arranged as follows:

Monday: Exercises
Tuesday: Platform speeches for the first section of the class
Wednesday: Platform speeches for the second section of the class
Thursday: Pantomimes
Friday: Open forums
Note: If one day a week is reserved for other work such as the making up of delayed speeches, or for private conferences and criticisms, the pantomimes and open forum discussions may be presented on alternate weeks.

The exercises and drills for the establishing of correct diction and for the enlarging of the speech vocabulary may be given as in the B 10th grade, a preface to each day's recitation, or they may be presented as a full day's recitation Monday of each week; the writer prefers the latter method of presentation for the advanced classes. These exercises would include various assignments in the following fundamentals: spontaneity; voice, including enunciation, pronunciation, pitch, flexibility of tones, resonance, quality of tones, strength and volume of tones; pantomime and gesture.

Each set of talks should be given as if for a particular purpose, or for a special occasion that might occur in everyday life, demanding a special speech type. The set of speeches may be grouped under headings that suggest a consecutive and progressive order:

1. The Home
2. The City
3. The State
4. The Nation
5. International Relationships
6. The Individual

Or, the set of speeches may be arranged according to the type of subject matter:

1. Demonstration talk
2. Appreciation talk
3. Travelogue
4. Informational or statistical talk
5. Convincing talk

In the open forum, the socialized form of speech development, subjects of a general and controversial nature such as *The Open Shop* or *Is the World Progressing* should be discussed. These meetings, in so far as feasible, should be conducted in the school auditorium.

Prefacing the oral interpretation of types of literature, there should be given exercises both for the development of mental processes involved in reading and for the application of these processes to the technique of interpretation. Types of literature that should be read orally by each member of the class are the following:

Narration	Monologues
Description	Dialogues
Exposition	Poetry: written in rhyme and regular meter
Argument	
Conversation	Poetry: free verse

The four weeks reserved for debate work in the B 12th grade would necessarily include: two weeks of intensive training in the art of debate with special attention given both to inductive and deductive reasoning, and to the various methods of proving a question; and, two weeks of application of this training, each student in the class being required to take part in at least one full debate.

The phase of the work concerned with speeches for special occasions would include the following:

Introductions
Announcements
Nominations
Presentation and acceptance
Welcome and farewell
Applications for positions
Salesmanship talks
A banquet (either patriotic or peace)

The five weeks given over to dramatics in the B 12th grade would prove well spent if the work were taken up as follows: one week for dramatic appreciation talks by the students, the different phases of ancient and modern drama serving as topics; one week for instruction in the art of acting; the remaining three weeks for

classroom dramatic interpretation of one-act plays and of excerpts from modern masterpieces of drama.

A 12th Grade: A CLASS IN SOCIAL ETHICS

In a super-model course in speech the work would be continued through the A 12th grade even though the class would meet but once a week. If such a plan were possible, there would be no better form for speech work than open forums upon topics relating to social ethics. Such questions as *The Practicability of Absolute Honesty, The Preservation of Home Influence, The National Necessity of Prohibition* could be discussed by these students of more mature experiences, especially if the work is placed under the supervision of a teacher who is particularly interested in the development of high ideals among the students.

ELECTIVE COURSES

Interpretation

There is no course among the speech arts more conducive to the unfoldment of versatility in self-expression and to the attainment of platform acquirements than is that of interpretation, especially when the work is presented in the modern repertory manner. As it is a basic course, whenever possible it should precede the course in dramatics.

When planning the work by days, the instructor will find the following arrangement productive of interesting results:

Monday: Exercises in spontaneity, voice production, word-illumination, imagination, pantomime and gesture
Tuesday: Rehearsals for individual readings
Wednesday: Continuation of work of previous day
Thursday: Recitals
Note: Although the readings and memorized selections may be grouped as in a regular recital, according to the content of the selections and relative merits of participants, yet the unity of a recital is accomplished in that the interpretations are selected from the same phase of the repertoire.
Friday: Continuation of recital

When planning the work consecutively, the instructor may wish to have the students give individual readings selected under the following headings:*

1. Story-telling: Fables
2. Story-telling: Modern short stories

*From *The Speech Arts* by ALICE EVELYN CRAIG. New York. Macmillan.

3. Lyric classics
4. Modern verse
5. Short prose selections
6. Narrative and dramatic poems
7. Dialect selections
8. Readings from Dickens' novels
9. Ten-minute readings
10. One-character speeches from Shakespeare's plays
11. Modern monologues
12. Duologue scenes from plays by Shakespeare and Sheridan
13. Modern dialogues
14. One-act plays

Note: The students should make outlines of all readings which, together with the following headings for constructive criticism, should be handed to the instructor before the student enters upon the platform.

Constructive Criticism

1. Thought
2. Position and pantomime
3. Voice
4. Natural or conversational methods of reading
5. Characterization
6. English
7. Relation to the audience

This form of speech work may well be concluded with a public recital.

Drama Class

The work to be accomplished by a class in dramatics divides itself naturally into the following arrangement:

First five weeks: Dramatic appreciation including individual talks upon phases of dramatic history

Second five weeks: Exercises in voice, imagination, visualization, pantomime, gesture, character portrayal

Third five weeks: Class-room acting of one-act plays

Fourth five weeks: Study, rehearsal, and presentation of a full-length play

Debate and Public Address

First five weeks: Technique of debate

Second five weeks: Practical application of rules and methods of debate

Third five weeks: Orations and open forums

Speeches given on topics selected from the following general subjects:

1. Round-the-world cruise
2. Appreciative talks (the world's great orators)
3. Individual readings of excerpts from the world's great orations
4. Original orations given as if upon some occasion of national importance

Remedial classes

Special voice classes of remedial nature should be part of every high-school curriculum. In the small high school, the work would necessarily be handled in one class that meets but once a week. But in the larger high schools the work should be carried on in separate classes meeting, if possible, several times a week according to the nature of the corrective work needed to overcome the speech inhibition or defect; for instance, there should be one class for stammerers, another for those with exceptionally poor diction, another for those who need correction in voice placement, and still another for the foreign students who need help in the pronunciation of certain English words commonly mispronounced by persons of that nationality. The institution of such classes would be the means of salvaging many students who otherwise would be lost by the wayside in educational advancement.

Such a course in speech as I have briefly outlined involves numerous contingent details which necessarily must be omitted because of the brief time allotted to this portion of the program.

A number of the high schools of our land doubtless have similar speech courses but these schools are all too few according to the replies received to a questionnaire sent out at my request by one of the librarians of the Los Angeles Public Library. And yet the universities of the country are demanding that the rank and file of the students promoted from the secondary schools should be better prepared in speech before they are sent on to them for advanced work in the academic and technical subjects; the business world is selecting young persons who can express themselves with distinctness and clarity; the young people themselves, and older

persons as well, in great numbers are seeking fuller opportunities for development in effective self-expression.

We, by our concerted efforts, can bring about radical improvements in the presentation of our subject, but we can do this efficiently only through the establishment of definite, well-organized courses in speech that are in keeping with our progressive and democratic ideals in the educational world.

SHIFTING THE EMPHASIS: AN ARGUMENT FOR NO-DECISION DEBATING

WM. SCHRIER
University of North Dakota

INTERCOLLEGIATE debating, since its inception with the Yale-Harvard debate in 1892, has undergone many changes. Many present methods in the conduct of it, which today are accepted as a matter of course, were arrived at only through the efforts of pioneers.[1] This process of change and experimentation is still going on. The past decade has seen the passing of the memorized debate speech and the substitution of extemporaneous speaking. Debates are not being restricted to the campus, but are being held more and more before luncheon clubs, fraternal societies, and other community organizations. New types of debates and decisions,—the split team, the "Oregon style," and various ways and means for measuring audience decisions—are constantly tried. The purpose of this paper is to analyze in detail one of these many changes, the no-decision debate.

In a survey conducted as early as April, 1916, in answer to the question, "Are judges essential?" 32% of the schools replied in

[1] As early as March, 1899, for example, G. P. Baker argued that the affirmative should be permitted to close the discussion "to make the work of the two sides more nearly even." *Harvard Graduate Magazine* 7:369, "Debating at Harvard College."

Again, in March, 1907, T. C. Trueblood expressed his views against the prevailing tendency of consultation among judges in arriving at their decisions. *Educa.* 27:390, "Forensic Training in Colleges."

the negative.[2] Twelve years later, in another survey, one-third of the colleges responding reported that they used the no-decision open-forum type of debating the most frequently.[3] Though this type of debating is quite common of recent years, there is not yet unanimity of approval of it. Indeed, one writer goes so far as to assert that the greatest enemies of debate are those within the ranks who favor and foster the no-decision debate.[4] In view of this diversity of opinion, it may be well to restate our objectives, and to consider this style of debate with reference to them in an effort to determine whether we should shun it as a curse or welcome it as a blessing.

What, then, is the purpose of intercollegiate debating? It has been stated by many writers at different times and in various ways. Few, I think, would find fault with the statement of G. N. Merry, formerly of the University of Iowa. Commenting upon the no-decision open-forum type of debate, he wrote: "Intercollegiate debating is held to inform the public upon a question which is a living issue at the time of the debate, and to give training to the debaters in collecting and expressing the arguments used."[5] These are the two outstanding reasons for holding intercollegiate debate contests—information for the public, and training for the debaters. While some of us may differ as to the weight to accord to each of these, all are agreed that both these aims are present.

We arrive at the crossroads in opinion when we consider the method, the driving force, by which these two laudable ends are to be obtained. The traditional attitude toward forensic contests has been "to use the instinctive desire to excell,"[6] "to capitalize the competitive element,"[7]—in short, to regard intercollegiate debating as "an intellectual sport."[8] The emphasis, therefore, has been on winning.

[2] PELSMA, J. R., *QJPS*, 2:130, "Quesionnaire on Debating."

[3] BERRY, MILDRED, *QJS*, 14:86, "Survey of Intercollegiate Debating in Midwest Debate Conference."

[4] PAGET, E. H., *Literary Scroll*, April, 1927, "Debate Takes the Offensive."

[5] *QJSE*, 7:282.

[6] LYON, LEVERETT S., *Educa*. 33:38, "Inter- and Intra-High-School Contests."

[7] O'NEILL, J. M., *QJPS*, 2:194, "Game or Counterfeit Presentment."

[8] ROLLO, LYMAN, *Century* 60:937, "College Debating."

Any one who would tamper with this incentive to win, who would *shift the emphasis,* must have sound reasons before he can be justified. However, the fact remains that today many schools engage in no-decision contests, and many have relegated entirely to the background the winning of decisions. In 1916, "a committee appointed by the debating associations of the colleges of Pennsylvania has recently recommended that the institutions should endeavor to interest their students in the open-forum type of debate, to diminish the emphasis on debate as a sport."[9] The present trend is well expressed in a recent article by Raymond F. Howes: "Gradually, but nevertheless surely, debating is losing the characteristics of a game. *The emphasis is shifting.* Audiences are being asked to decide questions on their merits; speakers from one institution to debate on the same team with men from another, against a like combination; the open-forum is growing in popularity; and several colleges have come to prefer no decisions at all."[10] J. R. Pelsma in his debate questionnaire contributes this: "As long as it [intercollegiate debating] is considered a game, an obvious end will be to win; and as long as winning is the goal, we strive to little purpose in attempting to eradicate the evils inherent in contests of this nature."[11]

Let us consider briefly some of these evils to which Professor Pelsma evidently refers. They have been mentioned so often before that it is not necessary to enlarge upon them. The indictment can be drawn up on many counts, and I believe there is enough evidence to convict the accused, the decision debate.

Emphasis on wining has brought on the evil of coaching.[12] By that I mean the tendency for the coach to go beyond criticism, to make the debaters his spokesmen. This evil was recognized as

[9] *QJSE*, 9:216.

[10] *QJSE*, 11:364, "Finding Debate Audiences."

[11] *QJPS*, 2:140.

[12] MACQUILKIN, NONA, *QJSE*, 6:69, "The Elimination of the Contest Coach."

SHAW, W. C., *QJSE*, 8:138, "The Crime against Public Speaking."

O'NEILL, J. M., *QJPS*, 1:14, "The desire to win becomes so strong that it affects not only the team but the coach also. The coach is always a human being, and when he is workng constantly with a team whose single thought is how to win this debate, it's almost impossible for him to adhere to the true pedagogical purpose of the contest."

early as 1896 and as long as we have decision debates, like the poor, it will be with us.[13] I believe the professor was right who advocated that the coach meet with the teams at rehearsal, offer some helpful suggestions and intelligent criticism, and then go off on a picnic and forget it; I'm afraid, however, that the "debate widows" during a debate season could testify that this commendable attitude toward coaching is not maintained.

Emphasis on winning fosters unfair practises. "Let's save it for last rebuttal" is one of them. Another is the selection of favorably disposed judges. In some quarters no card in the card-catalog is left unturned in the frantic search for a judge with a favorable bent. It seems to me that the very existence of approval lists, intended to combat this tendency, is in itself a sad commentary on the state of ethics in intercollegiate debates.

The third evil is a result of the preceding two—ill-will among schools.[14] The lack of a uniform standard concerning the amount of coaching often results in dissatisfaction and strained relations. Then, too, with the desire to win predominant, the natural disappointment at a loss and the frequent return of vanquished debaters with tales of a "raw deal from handpicked judges," result in ill-will, suspicion, and distrust. Thus members of the profession who should be engaged in pulling together for common ends engage in a tug-of-war.

The emphasis on winning lowers the professional standards.

[13] RINGWALT, R. C., *Forum*, 22:637, "Two faults have arisen: the first of these is what is commonly known as faculty coaching."

BALDWIN, C. S., *Educ. P.*, 42:475, "The danger arises when the coach goes beyond criticism into making the case himself; it grows as he consciously or unconsciously tries to make the debaters his spokesmen."

[14] Our experience on our two and one-half weeks debate tour this year provided a significant study in contrasts in this connection. Our debate against the University of South Dakota at Sioux City, a no-decision organization debate under the auspices of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, was followed by a spirited open-forum and was probably the best debate of the tour. That same day there appeared this news item on the front page of the Sioux City *Tribune* "Colleges End Relationship. ——— and ——— in Tiff over Forensic Contests. . . . The break follows a long list of unsatisfactory debates that have been held in the past beteween the two schools. Professor ——— ruled that they would not meet teams from ——— in decision debates because of ill-feeling after a debate last year."

All too often a man's job depends upon the number of victories he turns in.[15] The profession will never attain the recognition it deserves as long as merit is rewarded on this feeble basis. I wonder if also, as a result of the financial importance of winning, many coaches do not give time and energy to the debate squad which should be devoted class-work, to research, and to the building up of a well rounded department of speech. We must retain our sense of proportion; the extra-curricular sideshow must not be allowed to obscure the circus.

Emphasis on winning has the tendency to develop "the star system."[16] With the major emphasis on decisions and victories, a coach naturally hesitates using any but his very best men. The result is that during the whole season the debating is done by a comparatively small number. I believe debate training should be distributed among many students who approach a minimum standard of ability and that its benefits should not be restricted to a few.

A sixth evil of decision debating, perhaps not so pronounced, but worthy of mention, is the deleterious effect upon some of the debaters. Victories frequently cause in them a loss of perspective, which is just a nice way of saying that the victories "go to their heads." This would be bad enough in itself if decisions were an infallible test of ability, but is worse when very often this is not the case. This leads directly to the next point in this discussion.

We all know that the intrinsic nature of the situation in a speech contest is such that it is hard to determine the winner. The

[15] SHURTER, E. D., *QJSE*, 8:49, "It is a bad situation whenever an institution employs a man whose primary duty is to coach debating teams and whose position is more or less contingent upon his turning out winning teams."

SHAW, *W. C., QJSE, 8:143*, "They see that they, like others, will probably have to stake their reputation and their future again and again on a gambler's chance."

LYON, L. S., *Educa.* 33:39, "He sees that it is victories or his job and he needs the job."

[16] PELSMA, J. R., *QJPS*, 2:135, "Increasing the number of teams decreases the chances of winning."

GRETHER, EWALD T., *The Gavel*, Jan. '29, "The new style represents a decided improvement from the standpoint of the choice of speakers for a given debate. Decision debating forces the debating coach to use only top-notchers in order that he may have a successful season from the standpoint of victories."

comparison of a no-decision debate to a tie game in athletic contests does not hold. For "a just victory is much more easily determined in athletics than in debate."[17] In a football game, for example, the side which gets the ball across the goal-posts most often wins, and we don't need a referee for that. We can see for ourselves. But not so in an intellectual contest. It is all a mental matter; it all depends on how things strike a judge. Even when judges are expert and fairly selected, when we have minimized the judging problem by standardizing our bases of judgment, even then, we often find that the same stimuli cause different responses. Witness our 2-1 decisions.

For fear of being misunderstood, perhaps at this point I should state my *credo*. My primary objection to decision debates is that the emphasis is misplaced; it is on the decision,—it should be on the debate. My main objection is not the one I have just mentioned in the preceding paragraph, viz., the difficulty in arriving at meaningful decisions. For I recognize that proponents of decision debating have frequently pointed out in these pages that the same difficulty obtains in other forms of comptition, such as a musical contest. Nor is my main objection to decisions the ever-present possibility for the existence of the evils I have enumerated. For R. K. Immel may be quite right when he optimistically declared: "I know that these abuses can be eliminated where they exist, because I have seen them eliminated where they have existed. Both in university and in high-school contests, I have seen the spirit of rivalry cleanse itself of crookedness and take on the shape of healthy competition on a high plane."[18] Taken alone or even together, the possibility for evils and the inherent difficulty in arriving at decisions are not enough to condemn decision debating. But I do believe there is some cumulative weight to these two factors when they are combined with my further belief that decisions are unnecessary. Let us consider the objections to no-decision debating and see how we arrive at that last conclusion.

What are the charges against the no-decision debate? A. Craig Baird, defending the traditional American type of debating, embodies the two main objections when he says: "With school

[17] MERRY, G. N., *QJSE*, 7:281.

[18] *University of Texas Bulletin*. No. 2726: July 8, 1927. p. 10, "Speaking Contests and Speech Education."

spirit eliminated, . . . with the sport element conscientiously suppressed, it is hard to conceive of audience in considerable numbers following the debates year after year, and especially hard to conceive of debaters undergoing that thorough preparation peculiar to the American debate."[19] These two, then, loss of interest among participants and among audiences, constitute the main objections to no-decision debating. Both these arguments are "plausible at first sight, but ill-founded on close inspection."[20] Before considering each of these separately, let us consider the fundamental charge which is the parent of both.

That charge is that by no-decision debating the sport instinct is done away with. Professor Baird says that those who favor the abolition of decisions must provide a substitute incentive for the one removed. But have we removed any? I contend not. It does not necessarily follow that by abolishing decisions, the participants lose sight of the desire to win. That still remains as an impelling motive but in modified form, subjected to its proper place in the scheme of things. Paradoxical as it may seem, I believe we can still claim some efficacy for the will-to-win motive, even though a decision is not formally expressed. Why? Because there always is a decision whether there is a formal one or not! The speaker realizes that he is indulging in public appearance; he knows that his work is being evaluated, even though that appraisal is not to be formally made through the medium of a decision by a judge or judges selected for that purpose. His natural instinct of pride, of desiring to make a good impression, of wishing to outrival his competitor, makes him do his best in preparation and performance. This is particularly true when we add an open forum.[21] If his preparation has been shallow, it may be disclosed, and to avoid that catastrophe, he prepares.

This point of view is not mere theory. It is borne out in practise. In connection with the alleged loss of interest among parti-

[19] *QJSE*, 9:217.

[20] A characterization used in another connection by Alexander Hamilton in *Federalist Papers*.

[21] GRETHER, EWALD T., *The Gavel*, Jan. '29, "Whatever danger there may be of lack of incentive to real effort seems to be overcome by the open forum following the debate. No university man wants to be shown up in public and only the well-informed, alert individual is prepared to stand up under a third degree grilling of an audience."

cipants, G. N. Merry asks: "Will the students be willing to form a new conception of the sport phase? Are they capable of seeing the broader educational value of the new type of debating? Can the ideal be built up in the minds of students of working at a debate for the sake of making a creditable presentation of argument on a public question without the stimulus of a favorable decision as a token of victory?"[22] To each of these questions I believe we can answer an emphatic *yes*. Of course in institutions where the emphasis for years has been on establishing a top-heavy list of victories, it may take time; it will take a period of education. But it can be done because it has been done. Many institutions carry on no-decision debating extensively and forensics flourish. I can not speak authoritatively for other schools, but I can truthfuly testify that the University of North Dakota debaters work just as hard for a no-decision debate as for a decision contest. The best answer to the objection that participants inevitably lose interest is: "'Tain't so!"

Consider the next charge—audience loses interest. This is not without its humorous aspect in view of the artificial stimulation of debate by compelling public-speaking classes to attend, in view of the recognized lethargy in forensic interest when compared to the spectacle of intercollegiate sports. But let us assume that, by decreasing the emphasis on the will-to-win incentive through the medium of judges (which up to this time has in many places failed to draw audiences), the present bad situation is made worse.[23] It need not be permanent. As in the case with participants, when the decision complex and winning mania has seized an entire school, it is too much to expect a rational attitude on the part of the student-body overnight. But a period of education can overcome the temporary loss of interest among students.

But I would not linger long on this objection. For what of it? Raymond F. Howes contends that the shift in debating emphasis has created a debate audience problem. He suggests going to

[22] *QJSE*, 7:279.

[23] PARKER, W. W., *Natl. Educ. Assn. J.*, 13:301, "The field for experimentation in the methods of conducting debating contests is an inviting one. It appears to be a game in which there is little to lose and in all probability something to gain." [The context indicates he means there is no interest to lose to begin with.]

luncheon clubs, and outside organizations.[24] Capital! And why not? What is there about the objectives of debate, public information and training, that says we must restrict the audiences to college students? If the lack of college audiences drives us to community organizations, let us welcome the change; in fact, I would advocate this type of debating even where the college audiences are large. For here the second of the two shifts in emphasis I advocate comes in: Debating before organizations raises the present emphasis on the second of the objectives of debate, public information, the stimulation of public discussion, the moulding of public opinion, call it what you will.

Emphasis on winning has in the past caused a neglect of this use of debates as an educative medium. Is there any real reason why the goal of victories and decisions should be allowed to obscure the opportunity for influencing public discussion and for moulding public opinion? As early as 1900, R. C. Ringwalt wrote: "There is no reason why men from twenty to twenty-six should not say something about a political question well worth listening to."[25] W. N. Brigance, in reply to an article which attacked college debating because the questions discussed were those in which college students were "mental toddlers,"[26] wrote: "My personal experience with intercollegiate debaters leads me to the conclusion that they are perfectly capable of comprehending the questions they discuss."[27] He continues: "We are told these earnest straight-thinking youths who come to us for this training [an intellectual background for citizenship] should not be allowed contact with the vital questions of the day. It was such an argument that Macaulay said was 'worthy of the fool in the old story who resolved not to go into the water until he had learned to swim'." Why should we continue to stress the contest angle and to consider debate *training* for life? What is to prevent its becoming a touch of real life itself? If debaters in college do not possess the power on a small scale to influence public opinion, when does that magical influence start? College debaters are on the average perilously near the voting age of twenty-one to be engaged solely in winning a

[24] *QJSE*, 11:364, "Finding Debate Audiences."
[25] *Nation*, 71:489.
[26] COMSTOCK, ALAZADA, *Educ. R.*, 70:24, "The Cost of Debating."
[27] *Educ. R.*, 72:222, "The Debate as Training for Citizenship."

contest, and not to be engaged in the moulding of public opinion. If even interscholastic debaters can influence public opinion, cannot intercollegiate debaters do likewise?[28] H. S. Woodward and others are of the opinion that they can and do.[29] My point is not only that they can do so but that they should do so even more, but that the emphasis on winning frequently restricts the potential influence in this direction.

What are the advantages of debating before organizations? There are many. In addition to the administrative ones of avoiding repetitious debates before college audiences, and of providing opportunities for more speakers by providing more debates, this type of debate makes possible training in adaptation to the actual audience before a speaker. It removes us from the contest audience; the debater talks, not for the benefit of a judge or judges, but for the benefit of the audience before him and adapts himself to their needs and interests. He need not, for example, refrain from the judicious use of apt humor for fear of displeasing a judge.[30]

But the outstanding advantage of debating before organizations is that it increases the emphasis upon debate as public discussion. It places the emphasis where it belongs, on the debate, and not on the decision. That it seems difficult for these two motives, winning and influencing discussion in the search for truth, to be bedfellows was indicated early in the history of debate by G. P. Baker: "I should like to see my men trained in discussion for the sake of truth, not in discussion for the sake of winning an intercollegiate debate."[31] The possibilities involved in debate as a medium for influencing discussion have been obscured by the excessive emphasis upon debate as a sport, and I urge that we *shift the emphasis.* Thus the lack of student audience attendance may become a blessing in disguise.

I have tried in this paper to present the ideal debating situa-

[28] HIGHSHAW, JAMES LEONARD, *QJPS*, 2:365, "Interscholastic Debates in Relation to Public Opinion."

[29] *QJSE*, 14:86, "There seems to be little room for doubt that college debaters as well as congressmen and court advocates do effect changes of opinion."

[30] See the author's article, "Comic Relief in Debate." *The Literary Scroll*, Feb. '29.

[31] *Educ. R.*, 21:244, "Intercollegiate Debating."

tion at a college or university. I have advocated two shifts of emphasis in college debating, viz., first, that the emphasis on winning shall be reduced, and second, that the emphasis on debating as an educative medium for influencing public opinion shall be raised. The traditional, and in most quarters the present, attitude toward debate has been to regard debating as a game and to stress decisions and victories. I have suggested that this policy has been productive of many evils, that to abolish it does not entirely remove the will-to-win incentive, that it merely *shifts the emphasis* and places it where it where it belongs,—on the debate itself, and not on the outcome. The stimulus to win will still exist but will be rendered properly subservient to the more fundamental one of moulding public opinion. And the latter motive, by the diminution of emphasis on winning, will be correspondingly raised.

THE ORAL INTERPRETATION OF LYRIC POETRY[1]

ROBERT HANNAH
Hunter College

WHEN the student enters a course in the oral interpretation of lyric poetry, I am taking for granted, that he has had some training in the mechanics of reading such as centering, phrasing, tone color, grouping, pitch and so forth. Also, I should expect that he had received some instruction in the fundamental use of the voice. Although it may seem too much to say, I take for granted as well that the student has some knowledge of the kinds of poetry, and what poetry really is.

Perhaps it would not be too much if we, as teachers of oral reading, were to revive in the first few days of the class meetings the student's knowledge of the underlying principles of poetry; and to say something specific about the theories and kinds of poetry, thus preparing the group for a better understanding of the work to be done in oral interpretation. When I stated a moment ago that I did not intend to discuss with you the mechanics of oral reading, I definitely had in mind, what seem to me to be the three

[1] This paper was read at the Cincinnati Convention, December 30, 1927. It is an outline of a course of study which the writer has used in the classroom.

most important, and perhaps most frequently neglected, principles involved in the oral interpretation of the lyric. Recently I asked a number of people in different walks of life, some teachers of English, some scientists and some "hard-boiled" business men, what they have thought to be the chief weakness on the part of readers of such lyrics as the psalms, the hymns of the church, and pure lyric poetry in general. With one accord they all agreed that the reader, be he a clergyman, a teacher, or a platform speaker, failed to read lyric poetry effectively because he neglected to display and appreciation, imagination, or enjoyment of rhythm, in the literary form which he was presenting to the audience.

How is one going to develop in the mind and heart of the student the quality of appreciation? Appreciation is a term that is rather intangible and difficult to explain in the classroom, and to tell the average student that he must first appreciate poetry before he attempts to read it aloud may strike some of us as being amusing. I have always tried to instil into a group of students this one principle that literature and life, human life, are synonymous; that is to say, that there would have been no literature without life. Probably there is no form of poetry which so intimately and definitely reveals human life, the deeper thoughts and emotions of men, as the lyric.

In this poetic form the emotional quality dominates. Accordingly, the reader's treatment of emotion must be genuine; unless sincerity be secured the interpreter cannot expect to arouse true emotion in his hearers. Neither should we forget that the emotion of the lyric is universal. The poet's expression is not for himself alone, he gives forth the hidden feeling of the human race, he gives formal utterance to the feelings which we ourselves would express if only we possessed his power. The reader must comprehend this situation: for the moment, become himself a universal spokesman as he interprets the lyric to his audience. In the Twenty-third Psalm, David's cry is not peculiar to himself alone, it is the sincere and universal cry of the race. Also, the lyric is the most subjective form of poetry which we have. "With the lyric," says Felix Schelling, "subjective poetry begins. The individual emerges conspicuous in the potency of his art."[2] And the reader of lyric poetry must create, accordingly, in the audience a subjective situa-

[2] FELIX SCHELLING, *The English Lyric*, p. 1.

tion. The epic, the earliest form of verse, has a narrative quality which grips the interest and attention of both the reader and the listener; while in the drama we have plot and character, which contribute to the enjoyment and serve to hold the attention of the audience. The epic and the drama are, in every sense of the word, thoroughly objective. When we turn to the lyric we have something that is most highly personal, thoroughly subjective, and exhibits an infinite variety of moods in human life. In fact, it has always seemed to me that in studying the lyric for oral interpretation, one might well say what has been said of religion: It cannot be taught, it must be caught. It is, therefore, because of its subjective nature, that I believe lyric poetry should be in the last form to be studied in a class in oral reading.

To return to our former question: How is the teacher going to create an appreciation for lyric poetry on the part of the student? As I intimated, I think it is well to remind the student that the lyric is the most intense and subjective form of expression of human life. Perhaps, if the teacher stresses this *human* quality in the lyric he may do something to help the cause of appreciation. I have tried to point out in my classes that lyric poetry, besides being one of the natural organs for the integration of thought and feeling, has in this particular instance a specific function: it serves as the only possible science and practical art of life. For this reason, it seems to me that a teacher of oral expression can do much to create an appreciation for lyric poetry if he instils into the class this thought: lyric poetry is one of the outstanding interpretations of life.

In order to heighten their appreciation, I have had my classes read as a collateral exercise two or three interesting and instructive studies of the lyric. It might not be out of place to mention, in passing, that three of the books I am inclined to favor are Bliss Perry's *A Study of Poetry*—upwards of one-half of this book is devoted to an excellent essay on the lyric, I should recommend John Drinkwater's admirable study *The Lyric*, and Ernest Rhys' *Lyric Poetry*, one of the most significant books on this subject. There are innumerable books and essays bearing on this topic, but our intention is to have people read poetry, rather than study it, as it is studied in a course in English literature; therefore, I think it wise to limit the collateral reading to two or three short and entertaining essays on the lyric. This collateral reading, if briefly

discussed in class, will contribute much to the student's appreciation of the poetry that he is to read.

Unlike some teachers, who are inclined to emphasize such intangible terms as "appreciation" and "imagination," I am sufficiently practical to believe that the student who is going to read lyric poetry, should indulge in a great deal of analysis. What is central in the poem should be central for the reader and each detail should be perceived in relation to the centre. In order to heighten his appreciation for the poem, the student should make a thorough analysis, seeing the details in relation to the central theme or idea. This is true in any art form. However, do not let us conclude our work with a mere analysis. I think that the teacher should do his utmost to develop the analytical powers of the student, stimulate him to penetrate to the very heart and soul of the poem itself; but he, the teacher, should also remind the student of reading, that it is essential to make a perfect synthesis—not alone a thought synthesis of the lyric, but an emotional and aesthetic synthesis of the poem. It is very easy to tear a lyric apart, but it is more difficult to put these various parts together in order that the student of reading may see the poem as a complete and unified whole. Sometimes the unity of a lyric, or for that matter, any work of art, is found in a single dominant conception; sometimes in a dominant passion, sometimes in a single, low-toned mood of mind; sometimes in a harmonious sequence or suite of emotions. It is for the student of reading to determine this *attention centre* from which the unity of the poem springs. Occasionally one can at once and without hesitation put his finger on the precise motive of a lyric: it is some single definite conception. It was Professor Edward Dowden, I believe, who drew our attention to Keats' *Ode on Melancholy*. Amid all the varied imagery of the *Ode on Melancholy* the idea of the poem stands forth. The melancholy of melancholies, Keats would say to us, is that of joy which must pass away, and of beauty which must fade and die:

> "She dwells with Beauty—Beauty that must die
> And Joy, whose hand is ever at his lips
> Bidding adieu."

Over and over again I have heard it said that the audience must see nothing with its eyes, which tends to hinder its mental vision. The auditor must be made to imagine so vividly that he forgets the

reader in the thing read. Perhaps it is for this reason that my laymen friends stressed the necessity for imagination in the reading of the lyric, and criticized adversely most readers of lyrics, saying that they had no imagination. If the *audience* is to be perfectly attentive imaginatively, it means that the *reader* must have his imagination highly developed. How can the teacher impress upon the student the necessity for a highly developed and acute imagination? One experiment which I have tried is to have the group take a series of modern lyrics, lyrics written by present-day poets, and use these as a basis for a part of their study. One advantage of distinctly modern lyrics may be found in the lack of criticism, and critical material, available on these poems. There are no essays written about them, there is no body of critical material available in the average university library. Therefore, the student is compelled to *look at the poem* for himself; he is compelled to stretch his own thoughts and imagination in order to discover an interpretation; in other words, it is essential for him to use his imagination in order to arrive at a personal interpretation of a distinctly modern lyric. One other method which I have found helpful is to have the student read, and study carefully, Leigh Hunt's delightful essay "Imagination and Fancy;" for in Hunt's essay we have many admirable qualities. He was quick to discern imaginative genius in the poets of his own day, and we must not forget that in his treatment of "Imagination and Fancy" he recognized the lyrical beauty in two poets, hitherto unnoted by the world, namely, Keats and Shelley. The student who reads this essay, and who attempts to make it a part of himself, in most instances acquires something of Hunt's idea: the need for imagination and a new aesthetic perception in the reading, not alone of lyric poetry, but of literature as a whole. Teachers of interpretation must never forget that its *connotations* are really what make a lyric, or any poem, of use in stimulating the imagination. As a musical note is richer the more overtones it has, so a poem is richer the more it ramifies into avenues of thought, emotion and imagination. It is my belief that the teacher who attempts to train students to read lyric poetry should strive to present, not alone the mere thought which is to be found on the face of a poem, but he should do everything in his power to stimulate the imagination of the student. The teacher can point out some of the connotations

which the poem has for him as a teacher, and in addition, urge the student to discuss orally something of the connotations which the poem has for him as a student. We must gain not only the mood and thought of the poem, and present that to the audience, but it is essential to lead out into something which is found only in the realm of the imagination. We recall that Keats, in his *Ode on a Grecian Urn,* did not hesitate to sing:

"Heard melodies are sweet, but those unheard are sweeter;
Therefore ye soft pipes play on, not to the sensual ear,
But more endeared pipe to the spirit ditties of no tone."

It is this spiritual element in lyric poetry which the teacher and student must not fail to make a part of himself; it is something which the mere words, the mere printed page, will not of themselves convey. And the old scriptural phrase contains a wealth of meaning: "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

Ernest Rhys, defining this form of poetry and in speaking of oral interpretation, wrote: "'Lyrical,' it may be said, implies a form of *musical* utterance in words, governed by over mastering emotion and set free by a powerfully concordant rhythm." Here we have suggested one of the most salient elements which gives lyric poetry its charm. The rhythm and music of lyrical poetry contributes very much to the appeal which these songs make to the imagination of the reader. That is one reason why they should be read orally.

Rhythm is to be found in various activities of everyday life; in walking, dancing, skating. It is a regular recurrence of some definite pattern. The rhythm of the dance may be described as the recurrence of a particular step, while the rhythm of walking is apparent in the swing and stride, or more especially the easy tread upon one foot. Rhythm in music is distinguished by the repetition of stress or accent upon a certain note, and in poetry it is the recurrence of a collection of stressed and unstressed syllables. There is, however, a marked difference between the rhythm of music and the rhythm of poetry; the unit of measurement is not the same. This difference is revealed if we try to read a poem to music. In order that the student may preserve the rhythm in the reading of poetry, he can do no better than scan a stanza as a preparatory exercise. The scansion of poetry which is done by the teacher of English will do much to develop in the reader a keen sense for

the recognition of the rhythm of the poem. However, it is only by the oral reading of poetry that the true recognition of rhythm can be attained. Only in this way can we thoroughly appreciate the full sweetness which the poet intended; for the heart and soul only receive their richest pleasure when the beauty and rhythm touches the ear.

Lyrics should express the moods and feelings in rhythm that suggests music. It is the song-like quality of the lyric that is in contrast with the epic and the drama. The poet's soul seems to be set free by this powerful concordant rhythm. The teacher of oral interpetation should make clear to his class the necessity, and the aesthetic need for emphasizing rhythm in the reading of lyric poetry. Of such importance is this musical quality in the lyric, that one ventures to affirm, that to it many poets owe their niche of public favor. It is not too much to state that the melodious harmony of the lines of Swinburne, Ernest Dawson, and Alfred Noyes, with his "The Highwayman" and the song from "The Barrel Organ" have brought them their claim to fame.

In this paper I have briefly attempted to give some idea of my own methods of teaching the oral interpretation of lyric poetry. I know that there will be those of my readers who will not agree with much of my technique. I can only answer that it is a plan of study which I have found successful. I do not wish to undervalue the necessity for understanding the mechanics of oral reading; in fact I assume that the students who enter my class have some knowledge of this phase of the work. However, it has been my desire and purpose, in all of my teaching of reading, to try to create within the student a keener appreciation for the lyric; to do what I could to stimulate his imagination, and to lay special emphasis on the need for accentuating the musical quality or rhythm, for it seems to me these are at the basis of any technique of the oral interpretation of lyric poetry. Furthermore, in my teaching of oral reading, I have always tried to present the definite relationship between literature and life; the lyric is perhaps the most subjective form of poetry, and in some ways, the most closely allied with human life. In the broadest sense, the teacher of reading should never lose sight of the fact that this form of interpretation is one of the finest and clearest interpretations of life.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WORKS ON SPEECH COMPOSITION IN ENGLAND DURING THE 16TH AND 17TH CENTURIES[1]

J. FRED McGREW
Western State College for Teachers
Kalamazoo

THE following is a chronological arrangement of works published in England[2] printed in Latin or English during the 16th centuries[3] treating in whole or in part speech composition. See list next following wherein the same works are arranged alphabetically by author for ready reference.

Some of these works are not to be found in American libraries. Others may be found in our libraries by title or author. There are others to be found in collections of reprints, not listed in library catalogues by title or author. In so far as I have been able to locate reprints I have referred to the books where such reprints are to be found (e. g. Caxton's *Polichronicon:* the Proheme thereto is to be found in Brydges' *British Bibliographer).* For complete data concerning books referred to as containing reprints, and also for complete data concerning books of bibliographical information frequently referred to herein (such as Watt's) consult the alphabetical lists at the close of this article. Where bibliographers differ, for instance as to date of publication, Redgrave and Pollard's *Short Title Catalogue* can generally be regarded as authentic.

1479—Traversanus, L. G.: *Fratris laurencii guilelmi de saona prohemium in nouam rhetoricam.* (Wording from the 1480 edition.) Printed in 1479 by Caxton.

[1] This bibliography is a research paper begun in a Seminary in the Speech Department of the University of Michigan during the summer session of 1928, under the guidance of Professor J. M. O'Neill. I have been materially aided by the helpful data and suggestions furnished by Professor Hoyt H. Hudson of Princeton University and Professor W. P. Sandford of the University of Illinois.

[2] Some works by Melancthon, see entry under 1519; and by Caussini, 1600?; Campion, 1631; Tesmarus, 1657; have been included although not printed in England. Their use in English schools justifies reference to them. Also works such as Vives' *Exercitatio,* 1620, printed in Edinburgh, and Brunus' *Rhetoricorum,* 1666, printed in Aberdeen, have been included.

[3] One book by Traversanus and three by Caxton, printed late in the 15th century have been included.

1481—Caxton, William: *Myrrour and Dyscrypcyon of the worlde.* (First printed account of Rhetoric in English). Reprinted entirely by Carpenter in his reprint of Cox's *Arte of Rhethoryke.*

1481—Caxton, William: *The Boke of Tulle of Old Age ... the Argument of the Declamacyon.*

1482—Caxton, William: *Polichronicon.* The Proheyme to this contains discussion of Eloquence, and the Character of the Orator. Found in Brydges' *British Bibliographer.*

1517?–Hawes, Stephen: *Pastime of Pleasure.* The *Short Title Catalogue* shows that a fragment of this was published in 1509, with another edition, 1517. Watt gives date 1517. Carpenter, in his reprint of Cox's *Arte or Crafte of Rhethoryke,* page 26, states that it was written about 1506 and printed in 1517. See reprint of the edition of 1555 in Percy Society Pub., Vol. 18, edited by T. Richards, London, 1845. See reprint of the 1517 copy by Wm. Ed. Mead, in *Early English Text Society,* London, 1928.

1519—Melancthon, Philip: (No work of Melancthon's was published in England, but the influence of this educator, and the use of his *Rhetorica* in England, make it inadvisable to fail to mention him in connection with the rhetoric of the day). *Rhetorica.* See also his *Oratio Critiae,* (date?); *Ciceronis Orationes,* 1550; and *Declamations Selectae,* 1553.

1527?–Cox, Leonard: *The Arte or Crafte of Rhethoryke.* Carpenter, who made a special study of Cox's work and reprinted the same, states that the first edition was circa 1527-1530, and that a second edition was in 1532. Carpenter's investigation should make his estimate the most reliable. *Short Title Catalogue,* Watson, Watt, The British Museum, and Clarke give the date at 1524. Bloom states that it was printed by Robert Redman in 1524. A survey of the books printed by the printer Redman, found in Duff's *Handlist of English Printers* shows Cox dated 1532; but it also records a prior edition of Cox undated. Saintsbury dates it about 1524. Smith gives date 1532. See reprint of Cox's work by Frederick Ives Carpenter.

1531—Elyot, Sir Thomas: *Governour.* This is contained in several

reprints. See that by H. H. S. Croft. Also see Everyman's Library, edited by Ernest Rhys.

1533—Udall, Nicholas: *Flowers for Latyne Speaking gathered out of Terence.*

1545—(about)—Copland, Robert: *The Art of Memorye, that otherwise is called the Phoenix; a book very behoveful and profytable to al professors of scyences, grammaryens, retorycians,* etc. Translated out of the French.

1548—Tommai, P.: *Art of Memory.*

1548—(about)—Jewel, John: *Oratio contra Rhetoricum,* or *Oration against Rhetoric.* Translated by Hoyt H. Hudson in QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH for June, 1928.

1550—Sherry, Richard: *Treatise of Schemes and Tropes gathered out of the best Grammarians and orators; whereunto is added a Declamation showing that children should be brought up in learning from their infancy.* Translated from Erasmus. This was reprinted in 1555 under the following altered title: *A Treatise of Figures of Grammar and Rhetorike profitable for all that be studious of Eloquence; whereunto is joyned the Oration which Cicero made to Cesar.*

1551—Wilson, Thomas: *Rule of Reason, conteinyng the Art of Logique.*

1553—Wilson, Thomas: *Arte of Rhetorique.* Reprinted by G. H. Mair. There is some question as to the year of first publication.

1557—Anonymous (trans.): *An Homelye of Basilius howe Younge Men oughte to reade Poetes and Oratours.* Printed by John Cawood, Printer.

1561—Castiglione, Baldassare: *Courtier.* Done in Englyshe by T. Hoby.

1562—Susenbrotus, Joannes: *Epitome Troporum ac Schematum et Grammaticorum et Rhetoricorum. Short Title Catalogue* lists 1562, 1570, 1576, 1608, 1621, etc. Watson states it was written in 1540.

1562—Rainolde, Richard: *"A Book called the Foundation of Rhetorike.*

1563—Humfrey (Humphrey), Lawrence: *Nobles.* Watson, pp. 86, 87, shows this work to contain some rhetorical implications.

Watson gives it the date of 1561, but *Short Title Catalogue* gives date as 1563.

1567—Haddon, Walter: *Lucubrations.* This is a collection of Orations, Letters, and Poems, of Haddon, edited and published by T. Hatcher, including an oration on Eloquence.

1568—Fulwood, William: *The Enemie of Idlenesse; teaching the maner and stile how to Endite, Compose, and Write all sorts of Epistles and Letters.*

1570—(about)—Ascham, Roger: *An Epitome of Grammar; whereunto is prefixed an essay on true metnod of teaching the Latin tongue.* Note—I have included a few works written for use in the Grammar Schools, for some of these, such as that by Brinsley, 1612, carried considerable rhetorical matter, particularly in the field of Style.

1570—Wilson, Sir Thomas: *The Three Orations of Demosthenes in favor of the Olynthians with four orations against King Phillip of Macedonia.* Englished out of the Greek by Th. Wilson.

1570—Ascham, Roger: *Schoolmaster.* See reprint by Giles.

1570—Browne, T.: (A translation): *Nobilitas Literata.* Written by Sturm (Joannes Sturmius) and Englished in 1570 by T. B. (T. Browne). Watson, p. 87, states this lays down as necessary some knowledge of Logic and Rhetoric.

1571—Carr, Nicholas: *Demosthenis Olynthiacae orationes tres.*

1571—Drant, Thomas?: *The Chosen eloquent oration of M. T. Cicero for the Poet Archias.* Now first published in English. Supposed to be the work of Thomas Drant, according to Watt. But Harris in his *First Printed Translations* makes no mention of Drant, although he cites the translation. The *Short Title Catalogue* lists Drant, but not this publication.

1573—(Editor not known): *M. T. Ciceronis de Oratore;* J. Kyngston, Printer. Another edition, Cambridge, 1589.

1573—Lever, Ralph: *The Art of Reason, rightly termed Witcraft; teaching a perfect way to Argue and Dispute.*

1574—Hellows, Edward: Translation of Guevara's *Epistles Familiares, Wherein are contained very notable letters, excellent Discourses . . . Expositions of certain Figures . . .* etc.

1574—M. R. M. Scotum. (Robert Makilminaeus, who edited *Dialec-*

tae Peti Rami in 1576): *The Logike of . . . P. Ramus, Martyr, newly translated and in divers places corrected.*

1574—Horsfall, John: *The Preacher; or Methode of Preaching.* Written in Latine by Nicholas Hemminge (Hemmingsen) and translated into Englishe by J. H. Second edition in 1576.

1575—Gascoigne, George: *Certayne Notes of Instruction.* Reprinted in G. G. Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays,* Vol. 1.

1576—Fleming, Abraham: *Epistles out of Isocrates; and Certain select Epistles of Cicero. A Panoplie of Epistles, or a Looking Glass for the Unlearned . . . used of the best and eloquentest Rhetoricians that have lived.*

1576—Carr, Nicholas: *N. Carri de scriptorum Britannicorum paucitate Oratio.*

1576—Makilminaeus, Robert: *Dialectae Petri Rami.* (See M. R. M. Scotum, 1574, above)

1577—Peacham, Henry: *Garden of Eloquence. Containing the Figures of Grammar and Rhetorick, from whence maye bee gathered all manner of Flowers, Colours . . . Formes and Fashions of Speech,* etc.

1577—Harvey, Gabriel: *G. Harveii Rhetor,* or *Rhetor, sive Duroum Dierum Oratio, de Natura, Arte et Exercitatione Rhetorica.*

1577—Harvey, Gabriel: *Ciceronianus, Vel Oratio . . .* etc.

1577—Talaeus, Audomarus: *Rhetoric.* Whereas this was printed as early as 1547, the *Short Title Catalogue* shows that the first publication in England was 1577. Later editions were in 1588, 1631, 1636.

1577—Ludham, John: *Practice of Preaching, otherwise called, The Pathway to the Pulpit, conteyning an excellent method how to frame divine sermons . . . according to the capacity of the vulgar people.* Written in Latin by Hiperius. Englished by Ludham, Hereunto is annexed *An Oration of Orthius.*

1578—Lilly (Lyly), John: *Euphues. The Anatomy of Wit.* The second part of this work, *Euphues and his England,* was published in 1580. Both works reprinted by Croll and Clemons, London, 1916; extracts in Garnett, *Selections in English Prose.*

1579—Gosson, Stephen: *School of Abuse, Conteining a plesaunt inuective against Poets . . .* etc. Reprinted in *English Reprints,* edited by Edward Arber.

1579—Gosson, Stephen: *Short Apologie for School of Abuse. Found* in *English Reprints,* by Edward Arber, London 1868.

1579—Lodge, Thomas: *A Reply to Stephen Gosson's Schoole of Abuse, in defence of Poetry.* Reprinted in G. G. Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays.* Vol. 1.

1579—W. B. *The Lives of excellent Orators and Philosophers.* Translated from the Greek.

1580—Forrest, Thomas: *A Perfite Looking Glass for all Estates, most excellently and eloquently set forth by . . . Isocrates . . . Englished . . . with sundry examples.*

1581—Higgens, John: *Flowers, or Eloquent phrases of the Latine Speech . . .* etc.

1581—Mulcaster, Richard: *Positions, wherein those Primitive Circumstances be examined which are necessarie for the training up of children . . .* etc. Copy of original in the Michigan University Library. It is also found in a reprint by Quick.

1582—Mulcaster, Richard: *The First Part of the Elementarie. which entreateth chieflie of the Right Writing of our English Tung.* Reprinted by E. C. Campagnac.

1582—Ocland, Christopher: *Anglorum Praelia* (from 1327 to 1558) . . . *Angliae Statu . . . propter Orationis Elegantium. . . .*

1584—Fenner, Dudley: *The Artes of Logike and Rethorike plainly set forth in the English tounge . . .* etc.

1584—James VI (Scotland), James I of Great Britain: *Ane Schort Treatise Conteining some Reulis and Cautelis to be obseruit and eschewit in Scottis Poesie.* Found in G. G. Smith, Vol. I; and in Haslewood, *Ancient Critical Essays,* Vol. 2.

1585—Webbe, William: *A Discourse of English Poetry.* Found in G. G. Smith, Vol. 1; and in Haslewood, Vol. 2.

1586—Day, Angel: *The English Secretorie; or plaine and direct method of enditing of all manner of epistles or letters . . . corrected, refined, and amended . . . also Tropes, Figures, as either usually or for ornaments sake are in this method required.* The *Short Title Catalogue* dates *The English Secretorie,* 1586, and lists other editions with Tropes, 1592, etc.

1586—Dawson, Thomas: *Demosthenes Oratio in Mediam.*

1588—Fraunce, Abraham: *The Arcadian Rhetorike,* or *the Precepts of Rhetorike made plain, by examples . . .* etc.

1588—Fraunce, Abraham: *The Sheapheardes Logike; conteyning the praecepts of that art put down by Ramus . . . prayse and right use of Logike . . . comparison of Ramus Logike with that of Aristotle.*
Also, *Lawiers Logike, Emplifying the Precepts of Logike of the Common Law.* Brydges in his *British Bibliographer* carries a reprint of both of these works. The two are considerably intertwined. The dedication for the *Lawyers Logic* treats the *Shepherds Logic,* and the comparison of Aristotle and Ramus is in the *Lawyers Logic.*

1588—Kemp, William: *Education of Children.* Watson, pp. 90-91, says, "he lays down logic and rhetoric. He includes precepts concerning the divers sorts of arguments in Logic, Tropes and Figures in the first part of Rhetoric."

1589—Puttenham, George (?): *The Arte of English Poesie.* This has been reprinted many times. See G. G. Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays,* Vol. 2, and Haslewood, *Ancient Critical Essays,* Vol. 1; also Arber's *English Reprints.*

1589—Greene, Robert: *Ciceronis Amor, Tullies Love: wherein is discovered the prime of Ciceroes youth . . . profitable as containing precepts worthy so famous an orator.* Although this is an account of Cicero's love, it contains one speech delivered by Cicero to the Senate. Reprinted by Alexander Grosart, Vol. 7.

1591—Harington, Sir John: *Brief Apologie of Poetrie.* Printed in Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays,* and in Haslewood, *Ancient Critical Essays,* Vol. 2.

1592—Perkins, William: *Prophetica, sive de Sacra et unica ratione concionandi tractatus.*

1595—Sidney, Sir Phillip: *Apologie for Poetry. Defence of Poesie.* These are variously listed in various catalogues. However, they are the same work, printed by two different printers, both in 1595: This exists in many reprints. See Smith's *Elizabethan Critical Essays,* Vol. 1, and see *Miscellaneous Works of Sidney,* by William Gray.

1596—Munday, Antony: *The Orator, Handling a Hundred Severall Discourses . . .* etc. There is doubt that Munday should be given credit for this work. It was written by Alexander van der Busche, called Le Sylvain (Alexander Seluayn) and

Englished by L. P. L. P. is generally thought to stand for Lazarus Piot, which is one of Munday's pseudonyms. A short catalog of books in British Museum, listing the books to 1640, lists the book under Busche, but states that it was Englished by Lazarus Piot (i. e. A. Munday). Watt lists the book under Silvayne and Piot, but not under Munday. Harris lists the translation, but does not say by whom.

1596—Coote, Edmund: *The English Schoole-Master, teaching all of his schollars ... the most easy, short, and perfect order of distinct writing ... our English tongue ... alsoe a direct course how any unskillful person may ... use* (hard English words) *... for the English speech ...* etc. Watt dates the work 1627; Watson, pp. 177, states, "It was entered in Stationer's Register 18 Dec. 1596 to Jackson and Dexter." The *Short Title Catalogue* lists 1596, 1614, 1620, 1624, 1630.

1598—Butler, Charles: *Rhetoricae libri duo.* The British Museum dates this 1629; Watson, p. 441, shows its first date 1600; Watt gives it the date 1619; The *Short Title Catalogue*, 1598.

1598—Stockwood, John: *Disputatiuncularum Grammaticalum libellus, ad puerorum in Scholis trivialibus ...* (Grammatical Disputations). Brinsley, in *Ludus Literarius* (see entry herein under date of 1612), advocated this work for variety of Exordiums and Conclusions. Watson, p. 96, gives this the date of 1607, but the *Short Title Catalogue* dates it 1598.

1599—Blundeville, Thomas: *The Arte of Logicke plainly taught in the English Tongue* according to the best approved authors. Very necessary for all students ... *how to defend any argument ... and how to confute false Syllogisms, and Captious Arguments.* (Wording taken from the 1619 edition.)

1599—Zepperus, William: *The Art or Skil well and fruitfullie to neare the holy sermons of the Church ... now translated into English.*

1600—(circa?)—Caussini, Nicolai: *De Eloquentia sacra et humana.* (No edition printed in England). The date of printing is unknown. Watson lists it 1600-1620.

1602—Campion, Thomas: *Observations in the Art of English Poesie.* Printed in Smith, Vol. 2; and Haslewood, Vol. 2.

1603—Daniel, Samuel: *A Defense of Ryme.* Found in both Smith, Vol. 2 and Haslewood, Vol. 2.

1603—Florio, John: Translation of Michael E. De Montaigne's *A Consideration of Cicero, and other Essays. A Consideration of Cicero* is found in Byar's *Handbook,* reprinted from the Charles Cotton translation of Montaigne, which translation was printed in 1685.

1604—Jacob, Henry: *A Position against Vain-glorious, and that which is falsely called Learned Preaching.*

1605—(about)—Bacon, Francis: Byars in his *Handbook of Oratory* prints what he calls Extract Rhetorical from Bacon's *Essays, Civil and Moral.*

1605—Bacon, Francis: *Advancement of Learning.* In 1623 Bacon put into Latin, much augmented, his *Advancement of Learning,* (see D. N. B.) under the title of *De Augmentis Scientiarum* and *Novum Organum* in one publication entitled *Instauratia Magna* (Great Instauration). The Latin and English renditions of *Advancement of Learning* include discussion of *Colours of Good and Evil, Antitheta* (commonplaces or stock arguments for and against), *Formulae* (for transitions, conclusions, etc.), an account of Invention, and considerable else of rhetorical significance. Other of his works bearing upon rhetorical matters are "Promus of Formularies and Elegancies," "Of Discourse," "Of Council," "Short Notes for Civil Conversation," and "Of Negotiating." For an English translation of *Advancement of Learning* and *Novum Organum* see *Works of Bacon* by Joseph Devey. See *De Augmentis,* in Latin, and also an English translation by *De Augmentis,* by Spedding. See English translation of *De Augmentis* by Selby. See Whately, *Bacon's Essays,* for translation of some of the Antitheta. See also *Works of Bacon* by Spedding, Ellis, and Heath.

1607—Reynolds, John: *Commentarii in Tres. Lib. Arist. de Rhet.* (See Herrick, M. T., "Early History of Aristotle's Rhetoric in England," *Philol. Quart.,* Vol. V, No. 3, pp. 242-257). This was a manuscript which Reynolds left behind him at his death. The manuscript consists of interleaved comments on the three books of Aristotle. To be found in the British Museum.

1607—Draxe, Thomas: *Calliepeia, or a rich store-house of proper, choice and elegant Latin words, and phrases, collected* (for

the most part) *out of all Tullie's works.* Watt and British Museum date this 1612; but *Short Title Catalogue* dates it 1607. The spelling in Watt is *Calliopeia.*

1611—Coryat, Thomas: *Coryat's Crudities hastily gobled up in five months travels in France ... three crude Veines are presented ... besides the foresaid Crudities ... two of Rhetoricke and one of Poesie. That is to say a most elegant oration, first written in the Latin ...* etc. Reprinted in 2 volumes, published in Glasgow by James MacLehose and Sons, 1905.

1612—Brinsley, John: *Ludus Literarius* or *The Grammar Schoole.* Reprinted by E. T. Campagnac. This book contains considerable material of rhetorical significance.

1612—Vives, Juan L.: *De Tradentis Disciplinis.* Contains the views of this scholar on Rhetoric. See Book IV, 3. Watson, p. 263, gives this the date 1523; but the *Short Title Catalogue* shows the first date of any publication of this work in England to be 1612.

1614—Carew, Richard: *The Excellency of the English Tongue.* Carew wrote this in 1595. It was published in Camden's *Remaines in the* 1614 edition for the first time. Subsequent editions of the *Remaines* also carried it. A reprint of Carew's epistle appears in Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays, Vol. 2.*

1616—Robinson, Hugh: *i. Preces. ii. Grammaticalia quaedam. iii. Rhetorica brevis.*

1617?–Hume, Alexander: *Orthographie and Congruitie of Britain Tongue ... for schooles.* Printed in Vol. 4 of publications of Early English Text Society, 1865, and edited by Henry B. Wheatley. Wheatley states that the manuscript was undated, but he estimates date as 1617.

1617—Robinson, Robert: *The Art of Pronunciation.*

1619—Goulston (Goulson), Theodore: *Versio Latina et Paraphrasis in Aristotle's Rhetoricam.* The first edition in England of Aristotle's *Rhetoric.* The British Museum also lists *Aristotelis de Rhetorica ... libri tres,* 1619.

1620?–Prideaux, John: *Hypomnemata, Logica, Rhetorica, Pnysica, Metaphysica,* etc. Watt gives this no date. A short catalogue of books in British Museum to 1640 shows date 1620? (p. 1180, Vol. 2.).

1620—Granger, Thomas: *Syntagma Logicum, or the Divine Logike, serving especially for the use of Divines in the practice of preaching,* etc.

1620—Vives, Juan L.: *The Exercitatio.* A book of Colloquies. Watson, pp. 331, 336, gives date of publication 1539; but the *Short Title Catalogue* shows that the first date of a publication in England (Cambridge) was 1633. It dates an edition at Edinburgh 1620.

1621—Vicars, Thomas: *Manuductio ad artem Rhetoricam, ante paucos annos,* etc.

1622—Brinsley, John: *A Consolation for our Grammar Schooles ... a sure foundation for all good learning in our Schooles.*

1623—Bacon, Francis: *De Augmentis Scientiarum.* See reference under date of 1605, *Advancement of Learning.*

1624—de Lawne, M.: *Elements of Logic.* An English translation by de Lawne of the French work by Pierre Du Moulin.

1625—Farnaby, Thomas: *Index Rhetoricus.* A table or analysis of all methods of suasion. Watson, p. 460, states that the *Formulae Oratoriae* were added to his book, 1633.

1626—Wotton, Anthony: *Peter Ramus' Art of Logick. Gathered out of Aristotle, and set in due forme ... by P. Ramus.* Translated from the Latin of the *Dialectica* of P. de La R. (La Ramee, or Ramus). Watt states the translation was written by Samuel Wotton, the son of Anthony, and the dedication by Anthony Wotton.

1628—Spencer, Thomas: *The Art of Logick, delivered in the precepts of Aristotle and Ramus: wherein the agreement of both Authors is declared; the defects in Ramus supplied ... the precepts of both expounded.*

1628—Clarke, John: *Transitionum Rhetoricarum Formulae.*

1631—Vossius, G. J.: *Rhetorices Contractae sive Partitionum Oratoriarum. Libri V.* Watson, p. 445, gives this the date of 1621, but the *Short Title Catalogue* shows that it was first printed in England in 1631.

1631—Campion, Edmund: *De Imitatione Rhetorica.* (Not printed in England, but the author was an Englishman in exile at the time he wrote it.)

1631—Farnaby, Thomas: *Phrases oratoriae et poeticae.*

1631—Brinsley, John (the younger): *The Preacher's Charge, and*

People's Duty about Preaching and Hearing of the Word.

1632—Fage, Robert: *P. Ramus . . . his Dialectica in two bookes.* Not only translated into English but also digested into questions and answers.

1632?–Clarke, John: *Formulae Oratoriae in usum Scholarum conconnitae, una cum multio Orationibus Declamationibus.* The *Short Title Catalogue* dates the 4th edition 1632. Watt gives date 1637. Watson, p. 454, suggests date of 1627.

1633—Farnaby, Thomas: *Formulae Oratoriae.* (See *Index Rhetoricus,* 1625.)

1633—Butler, Charles: *Oratoriae libri duo.*

1633—Huise, John: *Florigium Phrasicon, or a Survey of the Latin tongue, according to the excellency of its proper dialect.* Recommended by Hoole (see entry herein, date 1660) for the matter of the theme and oration. (See p. 457, Watson). Watt and Watson give date 1659; the *Short Title Catalogue,* 1633. The latter spells the author's name Hewes.

1633—Clarke, John: *Dux Grammaticus. This contained Dux Oratorius,* used by Hoole (see entry herein, date 1660), in connection with the school oration. (See Watson, p. 460).

1633—Holyday, Barten: *A Short Work on Rhetoric.*

1633—Pemble, William: *Enchiridion Oratorium.*

1634—Barton, John: *The Art of Rnetorick concisely and completely handled, exemplified out of the Holy Writ,* etc.

1637?–Hobbes, Thomas: *A briefe of the art of rhetorique.* The *Short Title Catalogue* leaves a question as to the year 1637. The British Museum lists *A Briefe of the Art of Rhetorique, containing in substance all that Aristotle hath written in his three bookes on that subject, except only what is not applicable to the English Tongue.* The Museum caries a question mark in connection with the date of 1655. It also cites *The Art of Rhetoric, with a Discourse of the Laws of England,* 1681. Watt lists *A Briefe of the Art of Rhetorique,* without date for first edition, and states that the second edition was 1681. Watt also carries under Hobbes, *Aristotle's Rhetoric, or the true Grounds and Principles of Oratory . . . right art of pleading . . .* etc. 1686. Arber in his *Term Catalogues* lists *The Whole Art of Rhetoric in English,* being a translation of Aristotle by Hobbes, 1681. See

Byars' *Handbook* for a reprint of Hobbes' *Analysis of Aristotle.* See also *The Whole Art of Rhetoric* reprinted in Buckley's *Aristotle's Treatise of Rhetoric,* and in Henry Bohn's *Aristotle's Treatise of Rhetoric,* Hobbes' *The Art of Sophistry* appeared in 1861.

1638—Clarke, John: *Phraseologia puerilis Anglo-Latina in usum tyrocinii scholastici,* Or *Selected Latine and English phrases.*

1639—*Hermes Anglo-Latinus; or, Directions for young Latinists to speak Latine purely.* Watson, p. 316, states "the recognised school method in 16th and 17th centuries for teaching Latin speaking was the Colloquy . . . play acting, the declamation, and the oration."

1640—Dugard, William: *Elementa Rhetorica.*

1641—Jonson, Ben: *Timber, Explorata, Discoveries, Sylva.* This work exists in many editions. See that by F. Schelling or any collection of Jonson's works.

1644—Bulwer, John: *Chirologia, or the Natural Language of the Hand; as also Chironomia, or the Art of Manual Rhetorick.* These books seem, by the references carried in Watt and Lowndes, to have been published together. They are the earliest books in English upon gesture.

1644—Milton, John: *Tractate on Education.* Contained in many editions of Milton's works.

1646—Wilkins, John: *Ecclesiastes; or a Discourse of the Gift of Preaching, as it falls under the rules of art.*

1646—Taylor, Jeremy: *Discourse concerning Prayer Extempore.*

1650—Gerbier, Sir Baltharsar: *The Art of Speaking Well;* being a lecture read publicly at his Academy.

1651—Hall, Thomas: *Wisdom's Conquest,* or *an Explanation and Grammaticall Translation of the 13th Book of Ovid's Metamorphosis, containing that Curious and Rhetoricall Conquest between Ajax and Ulyssis . . . and the Prevalence of Eloquence.*

1651—Horne, Thomas: *Compendium Rhetorices.*

1652—Isaacus, John: *A Fragment out of his Rnetoricks.*

1652—Hall, John: *A Piece of Great Learning, entitled The Height of Eloquence.* This is the first English translation of *Longinus on the Sublime* (Watt).

1653—Wilkins, John: *Discourse Concerning the Gift of Prayer:*

shewing what it is, wherein it consists, and how far it is attainable by industry, etc.

1653—Webster, John: *Examination of Academies.* Significant in that it treats the sophistry of the rhetorical teaching and fallacious argumentations in the text books on Logic. (See Watson, p. 89). Watt dates this 1654; Watson 1653.

1653—Gardiner, Richard: *Specimen Oratorium cum Addita mentis.* Published also in 1657, 1662, 1668. In 1668 it included additional orations and letters. This 1668 edition seems to have been in English.

1654, 1655—Hall, Thomas: *Vindiciae Literarum, or the Schools Guarded; Centuria Sacra, or a Synopsis of the Tropes and Figures in the Holy Scriptures,* etc.

1654—Coke, Zachary: *The Art of Logic.*

1654—Blount, Thomas: *The Academy of Eloquence,* or *Complete English Rhetoric.*

1654—Robinson, Hugh: *Scholae Wintoniensis Phrases Latinae.* (The Latin Phrases of Winchester School). Recommended by Hoole (see pp. 457, 461 Watson) for the matter of the theme and the oration.

1655—Willis, Thomas: *Proteus Vinctus* . . . etc. For the use and benefit of Grammar Scholars in Making, Writing, and Talking Latin. Watson, p. 461, lists this as one of five phraseological compilations worth mentioning (Clarke, Robinson, Willis, Walker, and Robertson).

1655, 1656—Brathwait, Richard: *Time's Treasury, or Academy for the accomplishment of the English Gentlemen, in arguments of discourse,* etc.

1656—Bacon, Francis: *The Mirror of State and Eloquence.*

1656—Wright, Abraham: *Five Sermons, in five general styles or ways of preaching; 1. In Bishop Andrews, his way. 2. In Bishop Hall's way. 3. In Dr. Maine's and Mr. Cartwright's way. 4. In the Presbyterian way. 5. In the Independent way.* (Valuable as a comparison in the field of style.)

1656—Prideaux, John: *Eucologia; or, the Doctrine of Practical Prayer . . . as may satisfy upon all occasions, without looking after new lights from extemporal flashes.*

1656—Chappel, William: *The Preacher, or the Art and Method of Preaching.*

1657—Smith, John: *The Mystery of Rhetorick unvailed; wherein above 130 of the Tropes and Figures are severally divided from the Greek into English; together with lively definitions and variety of Latine, English, and Scriptural examples.* (The full title taken from the edition of 1673, listed in Arber *Term Catalogues*, Vol. 1, p. 157).

1657—Radau, Michael: *Orator Extemporaneous, seu Artes Oratoriae Breviarium*, etc.

1657—Tesmarus, John: *Exercitationum Rhetoricarum Libri viii.* (No record of an edition printed in England).

1658—Phillips, Edward: *The Mysteries of Love and Eloquence; on the arts of Wooing and Complementing.*

1659—Walker, Obadiah: *Some Instructions concerning the Art of Oratory.*

1659—Prideaux, John: *Sacred Eloquence; or tne Art of Rhetoric, as it is laid down in the Scripture.*

1659—Fox, George: *The Serious People's Reasoning and Speech; with the World's Teachers and Professors.*

1659—Basset, John: *Hermaeologium; or an essay on the Rationality of the Art of Speaking.*

1660—Bogan, Zachary: *Help to Prayer, both Extempore, and by a set form.*

1660—Hoole, Charles: *New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole* (As was the case with Brinsley's work, 1612, this Grammar School book contains much that is significant of the teaching of the composition of speech in the 17th century). Reprinted by E. T. Campagnac; also by Thiselton Mark.

1664—Comenius, John Amos: *Ars Oratoria, sive Grammatica elegans et Euridionis Scholasticae Atrium.* The *Short Title Catalogue* gives the author's name as Komensky.

1665—Johnson, Ralph: *Scholars Guide from the Accidence to the University; or short, plain and easie rules for performing all manner of exercise in the grammar school.* Probably contains about as much rhetoric as Brinsley.) Watt dates this 1677, but a copy of the 1665 edition is in the Harvard College Library.

1666—Brunus, Robert: *Rudimentorum Rhetoricorum.* (Printed at Aberdeen).

1667—Dryden, John: *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy.* This has slight rhetorical implications. Reprinted in Arber's *English Garner,* Vol. 3., and in Garnett.

1667—Sprat, Thomas: *A Simple and an Ornate Style* (taken from Sprat's *History of Royal Society).* This extract printed in Craik, *English Prose,* Vol. 3.

1668—(about)—Sprat, Thomas: *The Defence of English Eloquence and Letters.* Printed in Craik, *English Prose,* Vol. 3.

1670—Ellis, Tobias: *The English School, or tne readiest way for teaching children, or elder persons, to spell, read, and rightly pronounce English.* Fitted for use of English Schools.

1670—(about)—Sprat, Thomas: *The Error of Extempore Prayer and Preaching.* Printed in Craik, *English Prose,* Vol. 3.

1670—Eachard, J: *The Grounds and Occasions of the Contempt of the Clergy and Religion Enquired into.* This is reprinted in full in Arber's *English Garner,* Vol. 7. It deals with educational requirements of the Clergy. Contains much that is distinctly rhetorical in significance.

1671—Newton, John: *Introduction to the Art of Logick.*

1671—Newton, John: *Introduction to the Art of Rhetoric.*

1671—Ardern, James: *Directions concerning the Matter and Style of Sermons.*

1672—Milton, John: *Artes Logicae.*

1672—(Translator not known): *Reflections upon the use of Eloquence of these times together with a comparison between the Eloquence of Cicero and Demosthenes.* Written in French by Renatus Rapin. Translated to English.

1672—Walker, William: *De Argumentorum Inventione libri duo, Quorum prior agit de Inventione Logica, altera de Inventione Rhetorica.* Watson, p. 444, states this is perhaps the simplest of all the Latin Rhetoric published in England for school use.

1673—Kerhuel, John: *Idea Eloquentiae sue Rhetoricae.*

1674—Olivier, Petrus: *Dissertationes Academicae; de Oratoria, Historia et Poetica.*

1675—Townesend, George: *The Preparation to Pleading; being an Instruction to the young Clerks of the Court of Common Pleas.*

1676—(Translator not specified): *The Art of Speaking.* Written in French by Messieurs du Port Royal; rendered into English. To which is added *The Art of Persuasion.* This is evidently a translation of the French work of A. Arnauld and P. Nicole. Printed for Moses Pitt at the Angel at St. Paul's Churchyard.

1676—Gale, Thomas: *Rhetores Selecti. Gr. et Lat.*

1678—Glanvill, Joseph: *Essay Concerning Preaching; with a seasonable Defense of Preaching, and the Plain Way of it.* Arber's *Term Catalogue* gives it the following title:—*An Essay Concerning Preaching. Written for the Direction of a Young Divine; and useful also for the People, in order to profitable hearing.* (Arber, Vol. 1, p. 309). An extract from this essay is printed in Spingarn *Critical Essays,* Vol. 2.

1678—Shaw, Samuel: *Words made Visible, or Grammar and Rhetorick accomodated to the Lives and Manners of Men; represented in a Country School for the entertainment and edification of the spectators.* Watt dates this 1679, but Arber's *Term Catalogues* dates it 1678, with another edition 1682. Watt states it is a comedy. This would seem to be the case from the wording given by it Arber's *Term Catalogues* for the 1682 edition (Arber, Vol. 1, p. 510): *Minerva's Triumph, or Grammar and Rhetorick, in all the Parts of them, personated by Youths, in Dramatic Scenes, in a Country School. Presented to the View of all that love learning; but especially recommended to the perusal of young Scholars, and the use of Schools at their breakings up.*

1680—trans. by J. P. G. S. (name unknown): *Longinus on the Sublime,* translated under the title *Longinus' Treatise of the Loftiness or Elegancy of Speech.*

1680—R. W. (name not known): *The English Orator, or Rhetorical Descants by way of Declamations upon some notable themes both Historical and Philosophical.* In two parts.

1681—(Author unknown. May be Andrew Vidian who wrote *Exact Pleader* in 1684): *The Exact Pleader; instructing all persons in the methods of pleading that are concerned eitner in the Study, or Practice, of the Laws of England.*

1681—Robertson, William: *Phraseologia Generalis.* (Used in the composition of orations and declamations in the schools of the 17th century. See Watson, p. 462.)

1681—Mackenzie, Sir George: *Idea Eloquentiae Forensis Hodiernae; una cum actione forencie ex unaquaque juris parte.* Translated into English by R. Hepburn in 1711... Watt lists an earlier translation, 1701, without naming the translator.

1683—(Translator not known): translation of Cicero—*Tusculan Questions or Debates.*

1684—Vidian, Andrew: *Exact Pleader; or Select & Special Pleadings in the Court of King's Bench... with the metnod of proceeding in all manner of actions.*

1685—(Translator not known): *Logick, or the Art of Thinking... Rules for directing Reasons and acquiring of Judgment.* Written in French by A. Arnauld and P. Nicole. Translated by several hands? (Arber's *Term Catalogues,* Vol. 2, p. 149).

1685—Mrs. Warr (?): *The Declamations of Quintilian, being an Exercitation, or Praxis, upon his twelve Books concerning the Institution of an Orator.* Translated from the Oxford edition by a learned and ingenious hand? (Arber *Term Catalogues* Vol. 2, p. 149). This is listed in Watt, Vol. 1, p. 786 v, as having been translated by Mr. Warr in 1686. Harris in his *First Printed Translations* agrees with Watt.

1686—H. C. (name of translator not known): *Aristotle's Rhetoric ... made English ... in four books.* Preface subscribed H. C.; Lowndes states this was made English by the translators of the *Art of Thinking,* with no reference made to H. C. (See *Art of Thinking* under date of 1685 herein). The "four books" should be explained: beside translating Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (three books), H. C. translated the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum,* calling it the fourth book

1686—South, Robert: Sermon, *Of the Fatal Imposture and Force of Words,* Printed in Manly, *English Prose.* See also South's *Plainness of Apostolic Speech,* (year?), printed in Saintsbury's *Specimens of English Prose Style,* p. 115.

1689—Locke, John: *Remedies of the Abuse of Words; also Thc Right Use of Words.* Taken from his essay *On the Conduct*

of Human Understanding. These extracts printed in Byars' *Handbook of Oratory.*

1690—Berault, Peter: *Logic, or the Key of Sciences, and the Moral Science, or the Key to be Happy.*

1690—Kirk, P.: *Logomachia, or the Conquest of Eloquence,* from Ovid.

1691—D'Assigny, Marius: *The Divine Art of Prayer.* (D'Assigny wrote *The Art of Memory* in 1706).

1693—Locke, John: *Thoughts concerning Education.* See any collection of Locke's works for reprint.

1693—Gibson, Edmund! *Quintilian de Arte Oratoria: with notes.*

1694—Heath, Sir Robert: *Maxims and Rules of Pleading in Actions real, personal, and mixt, popular and penal.*

1698—Hughes, John: *Of Style.* Printed in Durham, *Critical Essays of 18th century.*

1699—D'Assigny, Marius: *Rhetorica Anglorum ... Oratoriae in Rhetoricum Sacram.*

1700—(about?)—(translator not known): *The Action of the Orator.* This was first written in French by Valentin Conrart in 1657. Reprinted under the name of Michel Le Faucheur in1686, (French.) (British Museum gives the date of Le Faucheur's work 1676). It was translated into English, but date and translator are unknown. A copy of the English translation is in the University of Wisconsin Library. Reference is made therein to the help in translation by Estrange and Wake. Watt lists Sir Roger L'Estrange and William Wake, but does not credit them with this translation.

Following is a list of the same material presented in the list immediately above, arranged alphabeticaly by author, for ready reference. For full title and comment turn to the chronological list.

Ardern, James—1671; *Directions concerning Style.*

Arnauld, A.—1676; *Art of Speaking, Art of Persuasion.*

Arnauld, A.—1685; *Logick, or the Art of Thinking.*

Ascham, Roger—1570; *Schoolmaster.* Also *An Epitome of Grammar.*

Assigny, Marius D'; See D'Assigny.

B., W.—1579; *Lives of Orators.*
Bacon, Francis—1605; Extract Rhetorical from *Essays, Civil and Moral.*
Bacon, Francis—1605; *Advancement of Learning.* Also listed under this entry are: *De Augmentis Scientiarum, Novum Organum, Instauratia Magna,* the *Antitheta, Promus of Formularies and Elegancies, Of Discourse, Of Council, Short Notes for Civil Conversation, Of Negotiating.*
Bacon, Francis—1656; *Mirror of State and Eloquence.*
Barton, John—1634; *Art of Rhetorick.*
Basilius— . . .; See entry (anonymous trans.) under 1557.
Basset, John—1659; *Rationality of Art of Speaking.*
Berault, Peter—1690; *Logic.*
Blount, Thomas—1654; *Academy of Eloquence,* or *English Rhetoric.*
Blundeville, Thos.—1599; *Art of Logicke.*
Bogan, Z.—1660; *Help to Prayer . . . Extempore.*
Brathwait, Richard—1655; *Accomplishment of English Gentlemen in Arguments of Discourse.*
Brinsley, John—1612; *The Grammar Schoole.*
Brinsley, John—1622; *Consolation for Grammar Schooles.*
Brinsley, John (the younger)—1631; *The Preacher's Cnarge.*
Browne, T.—1570; *Nobilitas Literata.*
Brunus, Robert—1666; *Rudimentorum Rhetoricorum.*
Bulwer, John—1644; *Chirologia. Chironomia.*
Busche, Alexander van der—1596; See Munday, *The Orator.*
Butler, Charles—1598; *Rhetoricae libri duo.*
Butler, Charles—1633; *Oratoriae libri duo.*

C., H.—1686; *Aristotle's Rhetoric.*
Campion, Edmund—1631; *De Imitatione Rhetorica.*
Campion, Thos.—1602; *Art of English Poesie.*
Carew, Richard—1614; *Excellency of the English Tongue.*
Carr, Nicholas—1571; *Demosthenis Orationes.*
Carr, Nicholas—1576—*Scriptorum Britannicorum . . . Oratio.*
Castiglione, B.—1561; *Courtier.*
Caussini, N.—1600?; *De Eloquentia sacra et humana.*
Caxton, Wm.—1481; *Myrrour & Dyscrypcyon.*

Caxton, Wm.—1481; *Boke of Tulle.... The Argument of the Declamacyon.*
Caxton, Wm.—1482; *Polichronicon.*
Chappel, Wm.—1656; *Art and Method of Preaching.*
Cicero—1573; (Editor not known) *M. T. Ciceronis de Oratore.*
Cicero—1683; (translation) *Tusculan Questions or Debates.*
Clarke, John—1628; *Transitionum Rhetoricarum Formulae.*
Clarke, John—1632?; *Formulae Oratoriae.*
Clarke, John—1633; *Dux Grammaticus. Dux Oratorius.*
Clarke, John—1638; *Phraseologia puerilis Anglo-Latina.*
Coke, Zachary—1654; *Art of Logic.*
Comenius, John A.—1664; *Ars Oratoria.*
Conrart, Valentin—1700; See reference under Le Faucheur.
Coote, Edmund—1596; *The English Schoolmaster.*
Copland, Robert—1545; *Art of Memorye.*
Coryat, Thomas—1611; *Coryat's Crudities... Rhetoricke and... Poesie.*
Cotton, Charles; See reference under Florio, 1603, in connection with *A Consideration of Cicero.*
Cox, Leonard—1527; *Arts or Crafte of Rhethoryke.*

Daniel, Samuel—1603; *A Defense of Ryme.*
D'Assigny, Marius—1691; *The Divine Art of Prayer.*
D'Assigny, Marius—1699; *Rhetorica Anglorum... Oratoriae in Rhetoricum Sacram.*
Dawson, Thomas—1586; *Demosthenes Oratio in Median.*
Day, Angel—1586; *The English Secretorie... Tropes, Figures, and Schemes.*
de Lawne, M.—1624; *Elements of Logic.*
Drant, Thomas—1571; *Eloquent Oration of Cicero.*
Draxe, Thomas—1607—*Calliepeia.*
Dryden, John—1667; *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy.*
Dugard, William—1640; *Elementa Rhetorica.*
Du Moulin, Pierre; See entry under de Lawne, 1624.

Eachard, J.—1670; *Grounds of the Contempt of Clergy Enquired into.*
Ellis, Tobias—1670; *The English School.*
Elyot, Sir Thomas—1531; *Governour.*

Fage, Robert—1632; *Ramus' Dialectica.*
Farnaby, Thomas—1625; *Index Rhetoricus.*
Farnaby, Thomas—1631; *Phrases oratoriae et poeticae.*
Farnaby, Thomas—1633; *Formulae Oratoriae.*
Fenner, Dudley—1584; *Artes of Logike and Rhetorike.*
Fleming, Abraham—1576; *Epistles out of Isocrates and Cicero.*
Florio, John—1603; Translation of *A Consideration of Cicero.*
Forrest, Thos.—1580; *Isocrates' Looking Glass for all Estates.*
Fox, George—1659; *Serious People's Reasoning and Speech.*
Fraunce, Abraham—1588; *The Arcadian Rhetorike. Lawiers Logike, Sheapheardes Logike.*
Fulwood, William—1568; *The Enemie of Idlenesse . . . how to write all sorts of epistles and letters.*

Gale, Thomas—1676; *Rhetores Selecti.*
Gardiner, Richard—1653; *Specimen Oratorium.*
Gascoigne, George—1575; *Certayne Notes of Instruction.*
Gerbier, Sir Balthasar—1650; *Art of Speaking Well.*
Gibson, Edmund—1693; *Quintilian de Arte Oratoria.*
Glanvill, Joseph—1678; *Essay Concerning Preaching.*
Gosson, Stephen—1579; *Short Apologie for School of Abuse.* Also *School of Abuse.*
Goulston, Theodore—1619; *Versio Latina et Paraphrasis in Aristotle's Rhetoricam.* Also *Aristotelis de Rhetorica . . . libri tres.*
Granger, Thomas—1620; *Syntagma Logicum* or *the Divine Logike.*
Greene, Robert—1589; *Ciceronis Amor, Tullies Love . . . containing precepts worthy so famous an Orator.*

Haddon, Walter—1567; *Lucubrations.*
Hall, John—1652; *A Great Piece of Learning, or Height of Eloquence.* (Translation of Longinus.)
Hall, Thomas—1651; *Wisdom's Conquest.*
Hall, Thomas—1654; *Vindiciae Literarum; Centuria Sacra.*
Harington, Sir John—1591; *Apologie of Poetrie.*
Harvey, Gabriel—1577—*G. Harveii Rhetor. Ciceronianus.*
Hawes, Stephen—1517?; *Pastime of Pleasure.*
Heath, Sir Robert—1694; *Rules of Pleading.*
Hellows, Edward—1574; *Translation of Guevara Epistles . . . certaine Figures,* etc.

Hemminge (Hemmingsen), N.; See Horsfall, 1574.
Hewes, John; See Huise, 1633.
Higgens, John—1581; *Flowers, or Eloquent phrases of Latin Speech.*
Hobbes, Thomas—1637; *A briefe of the art of rhetorique. (The Art of Rhetoric. Aristotle's Rhetoric, or the True Grounds and Principles of Oratory.) The Whole Art of Rhetoric. The Art of Sophistry.*
Holyday, Barten—1633; *A Short Work on Rhetoric.*
Hoole, Charles—1660; *New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole.*
Horne, Thomas—1651; *Compendium Rhetorices.*
Horsfall, John—1574; *The Preacher, or Methode of Preaching.*
Hughes, John—1698; *Of Style.*
Huise, John—1633; *Florigium Phrasicon.*
Hume, Alexander, 1617?; *Orthographie and Congruitie of Britain Tongue.*
Humfrey, Lawrence—1563; *Nobles.*

Isaacus, John—1652; *A Fragment out of his Rhetoricks.*

Jacob, Henry—1604; *Against Vain-glorious and Learned Preaching.*
James VI of Scotland—1584; *Rules to be observed in Scotch Poesie.*
Jewell, John—1548; *Oratio contra Rhetoricam.*
Johnson, Ralph—1665; *Scholars Guide.*
Jonson, Ben—1641; *Timber, or Discoveries.*

Kemp, William—1588; *Education of Children.*
Kerhuel, John—1673; *Idea Eloquentiae sue Rhetoricae.*
Kirk, P.—1690; *Conquest of Eloquence.*
Komensky, See Comenius.

de Lawne, M.—1624; *Elements of Logick.*
Le Faucheur, Michel—1700; *The Action of the Orator.*
Le Sylvain; See Munday, 1596.
Lever, Ralph—1573; *Art of Reason.*
Lilly (Lyly), John—1578; *Euphues, The Anatomy of Wit.*
Locke, John—1689; *Remedies of Abuse of Words. Right Use of Words.*

Locke, John—1693; *Thoughts concerning Education.*
Lodge, Thomas—1579; *Reply to School of Abuse.*
Longinus—1652; See translation by Hall.
Longinus—1680; (A translation). *Longinus Treatise of the Loftiness or Elegancy of Speech* by J. P. G. S.
Ludham, John—1577; *Practice of Preaching.*

Mackenzie, Sir George—1681; *Idea Eloquentiae Forensis Hodiernae.*
Makilminaeus, Robert—1574; *The Logike of P. Ramus.*
Makilminaeus, Robert—1576; *Dialectae Petri Rami.*
Melancthon, Philip—1519; *Rhetorica,* etc.
Milton, John—1644; *Tractate on Education.*
Milton, John—1672; *Artes Logicae.*
Montaigne, Michel—1603; (Translation by Florio) *A Consideration of Cicero.*
Mulcaster, Richard—1581; *Positions.*
Mulcaster, Richard—1582; *Elementarie.*
Muday, Antony?—1596; *The Orator.*

Newton, John—1671; *Art of Logick.* Also *Art of Rhetoric.*
Nicole, P.—1676; *Art of Speaking. Art of Persuasion.*
Nicole, P.—1685; *Logick, or the Art of Tninking.*

Ocland, Christopher—1582; *Anglorum Praelia ... Orationis Elegantium.*
Olivier, Petrus—1674; *Dissertationes Academicae; de Oratoria.*

Peacham, Henry—1577; *Garden of Eloquence.*
Pemble, William—1633; *Enchiridion Oratorium.*
Perkins, William—1592; *Prophetica.*
Phillips, Edward—1658; *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence.*
Piot, Lazarus—1596; See Munday, *The Orator.*
Pitt, Moses (?)—1676; *The Art of Speaking. The Art of Persuasion.*
Prideaux, John—1620?; *Hypomnemata, Logica, Rhetorica.*
Prideaux, John—1656; *Doctrine of Practical Prayer.*
Prideaux, John—1659; *Sacred Eloquence, or Art of Rhetoric.*
Puttenham, George (?)—1589; *The Arte of Englisn Poesie.*

R., W.—1680; *The English Orator.*
Radau, Michael—1657; *Orator Extemporaneous.*
Rainolde, Richard—1562; *Foundation of Rhetorike.*
Ramus, Peter; See Makilminaeus, 1574, 1576; Wotton, 1626; Spencer, 1628; and Fage, 1632.
Rapin, Renatus—1672; (A translation of Rapin) *Reflection upon the Use of Eloquence.*
Reynolds, John—1607; *Commentarii de Rhetoric, Aristotle.*
Robertson, William—1681; *Phraseologia Generalis.*
Robinson, Hugh—1616; *i Preces. ii Grammaticalia. iii Rhetorica brevis.*
Robinson, Hugh—1654; *Scholae Phrases Latinae.*
Robinson, Robert—1617; *The Art of Pronunciation.*

S., J. P. G.—1680; Translation of *Longinus on the Sublime.*
Seluayn, Alex; See Munday, 1596.
Shaw, Samuel—1678; *Words made visible ... Grammar and Rhetoric ... Minerva's Triumph.*
Sherry, Richard—1550; *Treatise of Schemes and Tropes.*
Sherry, Richard—1555; *Treatise of Figures of Grammar and Rhetorike.*
Sidney, Sir Phillip—1595—*Apologie for Poetry. (Defence of Poesie.)*
Silvayne, Alex; See Munday, 1596.
Smith, John—1657; *The Mystery of Rhetorick Unvailed.*
South, Robert—1686; *Fatal Imposture and Force of Words.* Alsc *Plainness of Apostolic Speech.*
Spencer, Thomas—1628; *The Art of Logic.*
Spratt, Thomas—1667; *A Simple and Ornate Style.*
Spratt, Thomas—1668?; *Defence of English Eloquence.*
Spratt, Thomas—1670?; *Error of Extempore Prayer and Preaching.*
Stockwood, John—1598; *Disputatiuncularum Grammaticalum.*
Sturmius, Joannes; See Browne, 1570.
Susenbrotus, Joannes—1562; *Epitome Tropirum ac Schematum et Grammaticorum et Rhetoricorum.*
Syluayn, Alexander; See Munday, 1596.

Talaeus, Audomarus—1577; *Rhetoric.*
Taylor, Jeremy—1646; *Concerning Extempore Prayer.*

Tesmarus, John—1657; *Exercitiitionum Rhetoricorum.*
Tommai, P.—1548; *Art of Memory.*
Townsend, George—1675; *Preparation to Pleading.*
Traversanus, L. G.—1479; *Fratris laurencii . . . rethoricam.*

Udall, Nicholas—1533; *Flovres* (Flowers) *for Latyne Spekynge.*
van der Busche; See Munday, 1596.
Vicars, Thomas—1621; *Manuductio ad artem Rhetoricam.*
Vidian, Andrew (?)—1681; *Exact Pleader.*
Vidian, Andrew—1684; *Exact Pleader.*
Vives, Juan—1612; *De Tradentis Disciplinis.*
Vives, Juan—1620; *The Exercitatio.*
Vossius, G. J.—1631; *Rhetorices . . . Oratoriarum.*
Walker, Obadiah—1659; *Art of Oratory.*
Walker, William—1672; *De Argumentorum Inventione . . . Rhetorica.*
Warr, (?)—1685; *Translation of Declamations of Quintilian.* (See reference to translation of 1686).
Webbe, William—1585; *English Poetry.*
Webster, John—1653; *Examination of Academies.*
Wilkins, John—1646; *Discourse of Gift of Preaching, as it falls under rules of Art.*
Wilkins, John—1653; *Discourse concerning Gift of Prayer.*
Willis, Thomas—1655; *Proteus Vinctus.*
Wilson, Thomas—1551; *Rule of Reason, conteinyng the Art of Logique.*
Wilson, Thomas—1553; *Arte of Rhetorique.*
Wilson, Sir Thomas—1570; *The Three Orations of Demosthenes.*
Wotton, Anthony—1626; *Peter Ramus' Art of Logick.*
Wotton, Samuel—1626; See entry under Anthony Wotton.
Wright, Abraham—1656; *Five Sermons, in five several styles or ways of preaching.*
Zepperus, William—1599; *The Art or Skil well and fruitfully to heare the holy sermons of the Church.*

In attempting to discover all of the books touching the field of Speech Composition I encountered some titles, of books which were not available, which leave a doubt as to whether they do or do not have rhetorical implications. These books should be surveyed

whenever it is possible with a view to determining whether they apply to this field, even remotely. I include several books in the field of education for children, for some educational books of the 16th and 17th centuries treated with Declamations and matters of Style. All are arranged chronologically.

1533—Elyot, Sir Thomas: *Of the Knowledge which maketh a Wise man.*

1535?–Elyot, Sir Thomas: *The Education, or Bringing up of Children.* Duff, *Handlist of English Printers,* shows date 1530, and 1531. See Vol. 1-3, under Berthelet the Printer.

1550—Sherry, Richard: *A Declamation showing that Children should be brought up in Learning from their infancy.* The above is a translation from Erasmus.

1553—(Author unknown. Possibly orders from the King's Court. Printed by John Day, Printer). *A Short Catechisme, or playne instruction conteynge the sume of Christian Learning set forth by the King's Maiesties authoritie for all Scholemaisters.*

1562—Fulwood, William: *The Castle of Memorie; wherein is conteyned the restoring, augmenting, and conserving of the memorye and remembraunce, with the safest remedies and best precepts thereunto in any wise appertayning.* A translation from William Gratarolus' work in Italian.

1574—Blundeville, Thomas: *The True Order and Methode of Writing and reading Hystories.*

1574—Hake, Edward: *A Touchstone for this time Present... Annexed to the above is a Compendious Forme of Education; to be diligently observed of all Parantes and Scolemasters, in the training up of their Children and Schollers in Learning.*

1590—Bales, Peter: *Writing Schoolmaster; conteining three bookes in one; The first, teaching swift writing, the second, true writing, the third, fair writing.*

1598—(Author unknown. Printed by Adam Islop, Printer). *The Necessary, Fit, and Convenient Education of a Young Gentlewoman, Italian, French, and English.*

1619?–Morrice, Thomas: *An Apology for Schoolmasters, tending to the advauncement of Learning, and to the vertuous education of Children.* The catalogue which lists books in British

Museum up to 1640 dates this 1619; whereas Watt dates it 1629.

1622—Peacham, Henry: *Compleat Gentleman, fashioning him in the most necessary and commendable qualities concerning mind and body.*

1623—Goulston, Theodore: *Aristotles de Poetica Liber . . .et Analytica Methodo . . . .*

1624—Hewes (Huise), John: *A Perfect Survey of the English Tongue.*

1630?–Reynolds, Henry: *Mythomystes. Short Survey of True Poesy, and the Depth of Ancients above Modern Poets.* Date may be 1633 although British Museum shows 1630.

1634?–Stirling, Earl of (William Alexander): *Anarcrisis, or Censure of Poets.*

1648—Hartlib, Samuel: *A Continuation of Mr. John Amos-Comenius School Endeavors; or a Summary Delineation of D. Cyprian Kinner, his Thoughts concerning Education.* (A translation).

1650—Lushington, Thomas: *Logica Analytica,* etc.

1651—Herdson, Hen.: *Mrs. Mnemoniaca. Lat. et Eng.*

1656—Cook: *The English School-Master.*

1659—Evelyn, John: *The Golden Book of St. Chrysostom, concerning the Education of Children.* (A translation).

1673—Walker, Obadiah: *Of Education, especially of Young Gentlemen.*

1673?–Coles, C.: *The Complete English Schoolmaster, or The Most natural and easie method of spelling English according to the present proper pronunciation of the Language in Oxford and London. To which is added an Appendix of useful observations in Orthography.* Arber's *Term Catalogues,* Vol. 1, page 152, dates this 1673, but Watt dates it 1674.

1674?–Strong, Nathaniel: *England's Perfect Schoolmaster; or Directions for Spelling, Reading,* etc. Arber's *Term Catalogues,* Vol. 1, page 172, dates this 1674, but Watt dates it 1676.

1677—Newton, John: *The English Academy, or a Brief Introduction to the seven Liberal Arts.*

1682—Howe, John: *The Right Use of that Argument in Prayer*

from the name of God, on behalf of the people that profess it.

1682—Mulgrave, Earl of (John Sheffield): *An Essay upon Poetry.*

1691—Walker, Obadiah: *Some Instructions in the Art of Grammar.*

1692—Curate, Jacob: *The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, or the Foolishness of their Teaching, discovered from their books, Sermons, and Prayers.*

1694—Blount, Sir Thomas Pope: *De Re Poetica, or Remarks upon Poetry; with Characters and Censures of the most considerable Poets, whether ancient or modern.*

LIST OF CATALOGUES AND BOOKS OF BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION REFERRED TO IN THIS ARTICLE

Arber, Edward—*The Term Catalogues from 1668 to 1709.* Printed London, 1903-1906. Three volumes.

Bloom, James Harvey—*English Tracts, Pamphlets, and Printed Sheets.* A Bibliography, 1473 to 1650. Two volumes. Wallace Grady, London, 1922-1923.

British Museum—*Catalogue of Printed Books in the Library of the British Museum.* Fifty volumes. Wm. Clowes and Son, London, 1881-1900.

British Museum—*Catalogue of Books in the Library of the British Museum to the Year 1640.* 3 Volumes. British Museum, London, 1884.

Carpenter, Frederick Ives—(See list of books containing reprints, next following).

Clark, Donald Lemen—*Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance.* Columbia University Press, New York, 1922.

Dictionary of National Biography. Vol. 1 to Vol. 63 edited by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, 1885 to 1900; also Errata, by Lee, 1904, and Index and Epitome by Lee, 1903, all published by Macmillan Co., New York. Index and Epitome edited by Sidney Lee, London, 1913. Additional volume edited by H. W. C. Davis and J. R. H. Weaver, Oxford and London, 1912 to 1921.

Druff, Gordon—*Handlists of English Printers 1501 to 1556.* London, Bibliographical Society, 1895 to 1913. 4 Volumes.

Harris, William J.—*The First Printed Translations into English*

of the Great Foreign Classics. London, or E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. 1909.

Lowndes, Wm. Thos.—*The Bibliographers Manual of English Literature, from the invention of Printing.* Edition by Henry Bohn. 4 Volumes.

Quaritch, Bernard—*A Catalogue of Books in English History and Literature from the earliest times to the end of the 17th century.* London, 1922.

Redgrave, G. R. and Pollard, A. W.—*Short Title Catalogue of English Books, 1475 to 1640.* London, Bibliographical Society, 1926.

de Ricci, Seymour—*The Book Collector's Guide. A* Practical Handbook of British and American Bibliography. Contains also excellent bibliography of early English Bibliographies. Philadelphia, New York, 1921. The Rosenbach Co.

Saintsbury, George—*A History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe.* 3 Volumes. William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1904.

Smith, G. Gregory—*Elizabethan Critical Essays.* 2 Volumes. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1904.

Watson, Foster—*The English Grammar Schools to 1660, Curriculum and Practice.* Cambridge University Press, 1908.

Watt, Robert—*Biblioteca Britannica,* or *General Index to British and Foreign Literature.* 2 Volumes, Edinburgh, 1824. Contains encyclopedia of all subjects, alphabetically arranged; and list of 40,000 authors, alphabetically arranged.

LIST OF BOOKS CONTAINING REPRINTS OF EARLY ENGLISH WORKS, SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO WHICH HAS BEEN MADE IN THIS ARTICLE

Arber, Edward—*English Reprints.* Edited by Edward Arber. London, 1868, 1869.

Arber, Edward—*An English Garner.* 8 Volumes. London, 1877-1896.

Brydges, Sir Samuel Egerton, and Joseph Haslewood—*British Bibliographer.* 4 Volumes. London, 1810-1812.

Buckley, Theodore—Hobbes' *The Whole Art of Rhetoric* is reprinted in *Aristotle's Treatise of Rhetoric,* translated by Theo. Buckley, George Bell and Sons, London and New York. 1894; and in *Aristotle's Treatise of Rhetoric,* Henry Bohn, 1850.

Byars, Wm. V.—*Handbook of Oratory.* Pub. Fred P. Kaiser, St. Louis, Chicago, 1901.

Campagnac, E. T.—*The First Part of the Elementarie.* (By Richard Mulcaster, 1582). Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1925.

Campagnac, E. T.—*Ludus Literarius* or *The Grammar Schoole.* (By John Brinsley, 1612). University Press, Liverpool, and Constable & Co., London, 1917.

Campagnac, E. T.—*A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole.* (By Charles Hoole, 1660). Liverpool and London, 1913.

Carpenter, Frederick Ives—*The Arte or Crafte of Rhetnoryke.* (By Cox, circa 1527). The University of Chicago Press, 1899.

Craik, Henry—*English Prose.* 5 Volumes. Macmillan Co. New York. 1894.

Croft, H. H. S.—*Governour.* (By Elyot, 1531). 2 Volumes. London, 1883.

Devey, Joseph—*The Physical and Metaphysical Works of Lord Bacon.* London, 1872.

Durham, Willard H.—*Critical Essays of 18th Century.* Yale University Press, 1915.

Garnett, James M.—*Selections in English Prose.* Ginn & Co., Boston, 1891.

Giles, Rev. Dr.—*The Schoolmaster.* (By Ascham, 1570). London, 1864.

Gray, William—*Miscellaneous Works of Sidney,* (Sir Phillip). Published by H. P. Burnham, Boston, 1860.

Grosart, Alexander B.—*Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene.* 15 Volumes, London, 1886.

Haslewood, Jos.—*Ancient Critical Essays upon Poets and Poesy.* 2 Volumes. London, 1811-1815.

Mair, G. A.—*Art of Rnetorique.* (By Wilson, 1553). At the Clarendon Press, Oxford, London, 1909.

Manly, John Matthews—*English Prose, 1137 to 1890.* Ginn & Co., New York, Chicago. 1909.

Mark, Thiselton—*A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole.* (By Charles Hoole, 1660). Published by C. W. Bardeen, Syracuse, N. Y., 1912.

Molesworth, Sir William—Hobbes' *The Whole Art of Rhetoric* (Digest of Aristotle), *The Art of Rhetoric* (Hobbes' own,

but very brief), *The Art of Sophistry* (also his own, still briefer), in *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes* (ed. by Sir William Molesworth), John Bohn, London, 1840, vol. 6.

Quick, Robert Hebert—*Positions.* (By Richard Mulcaster, 1581). Longmans Green & Co., For the Cambridge University Press, London, 1888.

Rhys, Ernest—*Governour.* (By Elyot, 1531). Everyman's Library, edited by Ernest Rhys; Introduction by Foster Watson. London, also E. P. Dutton Co., New York, 1907.

Saintsbury, George—*Specimens of English Style.* London, 1885.

Schelling, Felix E.—*Timber,* or *Discoveries.* (By Ben Jonson, 1641). Ginn & Co., Boston, 1892.

Selby, F. G.—*The Advancement of Learning, Book 2* (by Bacon) with notes by F. G. Selby, Macmillan Co., London and New York, 1893.

Smith, G. Gregory—*Elizabethan Critical Essays.* 2 Vol. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1904.

Spedding, Ellis, and Heath—*Works of Bacon.* 25 Vol., by James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas D. Heath. Published by Hurd and Houghton, New York, and Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1870.

Spingarn, J. E.—*Critical Essays of the 17th Century.* 2 Volumes. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1908.

Whately, Richard—*Bacon's Essays* with annotations by Richard Whately, ed. F. F. Heard; Lee, Shepherd & Dillingham Co., New York; 1873.

THE FORUM

PROFESSOR CABLE'S DECALOGUE

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Dear Sir: Professor W. Arthur Cable's attempt in the April Forum of this journal to reconcile the present conflicting ideals of American debating is, I believe, worthy of the consideration and discussion he requests. The fact that it will please very few would not be a fault if this decalogue were actually a compromise. But a true compromise, while perhaps completely satisfying to none, is nevertheless consistent; and consistency is not a noticeable attribute of this series of commandments.

The root of the difference of opinion over debating lies, as I see it, in the simple question: Is a debate speech a speech? Those who say yes, believe that the debater's primary purpose is to convince and persuade the audience before him that his attitude toward the proposition under discussion is correct. A speaker's success in this actual speech situation can be measured only by his effect upon his hearers. Therefore, the closer the speaker's contact with the audience, the better. The individual hearer should think of himself as a partner in the discussion, and should be given every opportunity to ask questions, offer his opinions, and adduce evidence to support his personal beliefs.

Those who, though they probably will not admit it openly, actually say no, believe that the debater's primary purpose is to show clearer thinking, more effective wit, and more impressive argumentative strategy than his opponent. His success, therefore, is measured by his comparative skill in thinking and speaking. His contact with his audience should be limited to that which a football player has with the cheering section. The individual hearer, therefore should confine his enjoyment to the vicarious thrill he obtains from watching the clever attack and defense and following the successive moves of a somewhat complicated game.

Perhaps a formula may sometime be found which will reconcile these widely divergent points of view. I have strong doubts, but

I am not certain. Of one thing I am certain, however: Professor Cable has not found it. The first sentence of Commandment I shows that:—"A public debate is not an exhibition; it is a conflict of wits and ideas." In other words, a debate is not an exhibition; it is an exhibition. He goes on, "Audiences should not go to it to hear a display; they should go for appreciation of skill in debating...." An audience should not go to hear a display; they should go to hear a display. For what in heaven's name can debaters display under any circumstances except skill—or lack of skill—in debating? That is all they have to offer. Professor Cable's statement is similar to this: If you go to hear Kreisler play, don't think of his technique of bowing and fingering; think only of his skill on the violin.

For the furthering working out of this inconsistency, compare the following passages: Commandment 6: "Contest debating is not a means of convincing the audience of the right and wrong of a question; it is an intellectual game of comparative skills, an intellectual fencing match, a mental prize fight;" Commandment 7: "Training in contest debating... includes training in meeting audiences successfully. The training, therefore,...includes training in persuasive speaking." Compare, also, Commandment 4: "Training in argumentation and debating is not for the purpose of winning decisions in contest debates," with Commandment 5: "A decision... means that the winning team is more skillful in sound thinking and effective speaking than the losing team." In Other words, if one considers these four commandments together, the result is something like this: A debate is a contest of comparative skill in sound thinking and effective speaking; a decision tells which team, in such a contest, is superior; the purpose of correct training is to develop this sound thinking and effective speaking; but the winning of decisions is not important. And again, a debater cannot hope to convince an audience on the merits of the question; the audience should not come to be convinced, but to enjoy the skill of the debaters; but training in contest debating includes training in persuasive speaking; and the audience should not come to hear a display. But I am growing dizzy. The moral is that when large equal squares of black and white are cut into small squares, shuffled, and spaced evenly, they produce not a large gray square but a checker-board.

All this is an over-long introduction to a description of an experiment in debating tried at Washington University last fall. I have always sided with those who believe that a debate should be a true exercise in speaking, and that the part of the audience is therefore of great importance. We had an opportunity to test that theory in our debate with Sydney, Australia. The plan was to follow as closely as possible the procedure of the Oxford Union. Members of all the campus discussion clubs—Stump, the men's debate club; Ken Maer, the women's debate club; Menorah, the League of Women Voters, Delta Sigma Rho, the men's debate squad, and the women's debate squad—comprised for the evening the Washington Forensic Union. Luckily we had on the campus a student who had toured England with a Westminster College debate team. At a rehearsal meeting, he instructed the members of the Union in the Oxford rules of order. The rules were then and there tried out on the three Washington speakers. The resulting questions, objections, and cat-calls caused extensive revisions in the debaters' speeches.

The chairman for the actual debate was a former Rhodes scholar who had been an outstanding member of the Oxford Union. In his introductory remarks, he explained the procedure again, both for the member of the Union, who sat in a special square of seats in the middle of the auditorium, and for the audience. The "Right Honorable Members" who were "on the paper," or, in other words, on the program, sat on the platform as in an ordinary American debate, the affirmative on the president's right and the negative on his left. Two Sydney speakers spoke from the right and one from the left.

It was made clear at the start that members of the Union had the privilege of interrupting any speaker at any time to ask a question or to deny the truth of a specific allegation, and that any "honorable member" might speak on the subject for five minutes at the conclusion of the speeches "on the paper." Not only the Union, but also the general audience, though uninvited, jumped into the arguments, when, for instance, one speaker atacked the black list of the D. A. R. (he was condemning nationalism), a member of the audience immediately rose to demand authorities. The speaker supplied them. The questioner then attacked his interpretation of the facts, and had to be silenced by

the chairman, who ruled that the matter should be reserved until after the speeches "on the paper" had been finished. The speaker went on undisturbed for a few minutes, until he began to read some scurrilous attacks on Governor Smith's Americanism. Several more members of the audience arose. One wanted to know the name of the newspaper from which the clipping was taken; another asked the size of the paper's circulation; and a third summed up the attack by charging that the speaker was using examples not typical of true American feeling. The speaker answered the first two quickly and replied at more length to the third, amid applause. Another speaker was caught without evidence for the statement that Ireland is now a free state, and retired from his skirmish with the honorable member on the floor in poor order. Thus the debate went on, with the audience following every word carefully, looking for inconsistencies, false interpretations, and misstatements of facts, and interrupting the speakers when they found any cause.

At the end of the main speeches, the chairman had to choose among a half-dozen claimants for the floor. Four spoke in rapid succession, and more were fighting for the privilege when the chairman closed the meeting because of the lateness of the hour. Incidentally, two Delta Sigma Rho men whom I had planted in the audience with prepared speeches had no chance to open their mouths.

Making due allowance for novelty of the plan, I believe that this Union debate was a most effective exercise in actual public speaking for the debaters and an unusually interesting affair for the audience. It brought out unexpected ability in one speaker, whom I had considered rather mediocre, and brought about the collapse of another, whose record in ordinary contest debating had been exceptionally good. Another interesting point is that for several days afterward conversation among students and faculty who had heard the debate turned again and again to the *arguments advanced* during the discussion. Controversy over the D. A. R. blacklist, the attacks on Governor Smith, American isolation in world affairs, Italian patriotism, and Irish freedom raged throughout the university. Not one person volunteered an opinion as to the relative merits of the debaters as speakers. I gained that information only by definite questioning. Furthermore, everyone

I talked with thought the debate a huge success, when as a matter of fact no speech, *as a speech,* was particularly good, and debate coaches in other universities near here thought the Sydney team as a whole rather weak in contest debates.

The conclusion seems inevitable that there *is* a difference, a vital difference, between contest debating and true public speaking, not only for the speaker but also for the audience. Audiences prefer true public speaking. And if speech training is to lead toward "effectiveness and success in all the affairs of life, either in the sequestered cloister or on the highway of life where man meets man," if I may quote Professor Cable once more, the debates, too, will gain more from facing actual speech situations.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND F. HOWES, *Washington University*

THE EXPERT JUDGE OF DEBATING

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Dear Sir: Should the expert judge be called upon to earn his fee? Is he paid to come hastily into the auditorium a few moments before the debate, render a short, and many times, unsatisfactory decision, and then leave even more hurriedly than he came? Is there any way of making the decision more than merely a statement that he believes that one side has won? This may be all that is necessary for the audience to know, but is it not rather expensive to pay a man twenty or twenty-five dollars and expenses for giving an opinion, unqualified by good reasons for that statement? In other words, how can we make the decision indicate more than simply "victory" or "defeat"?

Let us analyze the problem to see if we cannot find a way of solving it.

Must we have decisions? I do not believe that it will be necessary to prove that, for the most part, we do. The members of the student council who portion out the money for the activity insist that there must be a good percentage of decisions; they want to know how they compare with other schools of the same class. The debaters also want decisions; even the best of them feel that they should have more to work for than merely the pleasure of intellectual controversy. Although there are many who think other-

wise I believe that we will all agree that a certain number of decisions is necessary.

What is it that often makes the decision of the expert judge so unsatisfactory? It seems to me that the difficulty arises, in many cases, because the judge and the teams do not agree as to what constitutes good debating. A judge of one of our recent debates scored our team for not using initial rebuttal; the next week, the same team was criticized for using initial rebuttal. The aforementioned judge also thought that all refutation should be kept for the rebuttal, and further suggested that most of the best evidence should be saved for these speeches. At another time our negative team was commended for piling the burden of proof onto the affirmative; the judge was an ex-college debater, at present a professor of history. The next day the same team was condemned to the lowest depths by an expert judge, who is a debate coach, for speaking about the affirmative having such a thing as a burden of proof. Our affirmative is usually trained to present a plan. In one debate this team was scored for assuming such a burden unless the negative compelled them to do so; another time they were told that unless they had presented their plan the expert would have voted against them even though the negative had failed to mention the absence of said plan. Several years ago I had three judges, all teachers of speech and supposedly experts. Two of them based their judgment upon skill in debating and relative strength of evidence presented. The third based his judgment upon the ability of one team to tell interesting stories, give striking illustrations, and appeal to the emotions. This expert told me that he considered a debate a form of recreation and that the team which could better entertain him, won.

Probably the best example of the inability of judges to agree is found in an incident that occurred in April, 1927 at the state meeting of the Ohio Teachers of Speech at Columbus, Ohio. At that meeting, the two best teams of the Pi Kappa Delta convention, which had just closed at Heidelberg, were asked to speak. After the debae was over, fourteen debate coaches from the leading schools of Ohio rendered a decision. The vote stood seven to seven. Each of the fourteen could and did justify his vote. The principal controversy arose over the question as to whether or not the affirmative should have presented a plan. If only one

of these fourteen judges had rendered the decision luck would have determined the verdict. I think that this example proves that experts do not agree as to what constitutes good debating and that we should atempt to find some way of meeting the problem.

Standardization of debating is not the solution. We are dealing with human beings and in many cases very independent human beings. It is neither a fault nor a crime for a judge to see and understand the technique of debating differently than does a certain team or coach of one of the teams. But is it not a hopeless situation when you have a judge for a contest who believes in the good old style of legal debating and one of the teams is ready to give a good entertainment? We must work, not for a general agreement, but for some kind of a specific agreement or understanding between the judge and the two teams about the standard which is to be used in the particular debate.

In coming to an agreement between the judge and the teams we should insist first, that the judge know the question. This will be hard to force upon the judge but if he is asked point blank whether or not he has made a study of the subject and he is given to understand that he is expected to be familiar with the argument, he will probably come to the debate better prepared to act as a critic. It will be argued that we are interested only in the skill of the debaters, but sometimes that skill can be determined only when there is some appreciation of what is to be done. In many cases, skill can not be judged unless the critic knows what material there is and how it must be handled.

In addition to knowing the question, the judge should be willing to tell both schools his standard of a good debate at least a week before the contest takes place. If there are any questions to be asked by either school he should be willing to give information to both of them. Both teams would then know definitely what they were to be judged on. At the present time the teams rush to the judge after the debate and ask him for the reasons for his decision. Why not do this before, giving each team an equal chance to prepare with the points in mind upon which they are to be judged? If there are any great points of difference, the teams are to conform to the judge's opinion rather than make the judge conform to the ideas of one or the other of the teams.

May we state a hypothetical case to demonstrate what we

mean? Mr. A has been selected to judge a contest between two schools. Both write to him for his standard of judgment. He would reply, assuming, for example, that this should be his standard, somethings as follows: the affirmative must show a need for a change; in this debate a detailed plan is essential; that the plan is supported by good authority, and that it has been tried. The negative may do one of two things: first, show that there is no need for a change; that a few minor changes would help the status quo; that the affirmative plan is not practical or practicable; or; that there is a need for a change; that another plan than that of the affirmative should be adopted. Also, in general the judge might indicate: that there should be plenty of initial rebuttal; that, in the rebuttal, care should be taken to state the opposing argument and to apply the evidence to that statement; that discussing a point is not refuting it; that, in delivery, memorized speeches should be discounted, etc., etc.

Both teams now have a standard to guide them in their preparation. If their idea of the art of debating has been to tell good stories, to pun, and to engage in flights of oratory they will have to change their policy or lose the vote of the judge. Is it not reasonable to suppose that there will be a much more even debate when both teams know what is expected of them? And if the judge feels that a plan is essential to the affirmative argument and one is not presented, would it not be better to know that before the debate rather than afterwards? It seems to me that more effective debating would surely be the result.

We have tried the foregoing idea on a small scale. Before the debate we have had the judge outline his standard of judgment for the debaters. I have felt that this has been a good thing because it has cleared the air before the contest and has prevented quibbling with the judge afterwards. To tell them several weeks before should be much better than thirty minutes previous to the debate.

The judge in this system would not be merely a machine which would give forth a decision but would play an important part in making a debate even, effective, and worth while. The judge and the debaters would have a common understanding, and all parties concerned would strive to do the very best work possible.

Very truly yours,

LEON MCCARTY, *University of Cincinnati*

CONSENSUS IN DEBATE

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Dear Sir: With the introduction of the open forum, the result anticipated was the discussion type of debate that would substitute the search for truth for the aim to win. Almost any discussion on the debate situation will indicate how far we have strayed from the idea of the open-forum decisionless debate.

I believe that a reason for this failure may be found in the aimless character of open-forum discussions. And the obstinacy with which the debater defends his stand does not relieve this aimlessness because, too often, the questions arising are disposed of arbitrarily rather than being followed to a logical conclusion. Thus, the open forum generally results, not in the discussion of a perplexing problem to conscientiously search for the truth, but in a prolonged and aimless rebuttal with the idea supreme that should one point be frankly conceded, the case is lost. Would it not be better if a debate could be so conducted that the debaters, after the debate proper, could truly and completely throw off the cloak of formality and superficiality, and actually try—with the opponents, with the audience—to arrive at a consensus of opinion on at least one point of controversy? If there is much of truth on one side and also on the other, if each side has its fallacies, then the aim in the open forum should be to try to discover a meeting point of the two sides.

With consensus of opinion as the aim in the open forum, there would be point to the debate for both the audience and the debaters. The audience would understand that the debate proper, besides training the speakers, also served the purpose of furnishing information on the question. For the debater, ability to answer questions cleverly would not suffice, side-stepping would be out of place. He would have to know his subject thoroughly; he would have to learn to present his case accurately, neither over-stating it nor under-stating it.

In trying the plan with a class of high-school pupils, the difficulty most evident was that agreement seemed a matter of forced acquiescence rather than a genuine expression of accord. This seems hardly encouraging, but, then, the conditions were anything but ideal. The average college debate situation, however, is favorable for the operation of such a plan because the three essen-

tials,—rasonably mature debaters, a small audience, and a capable chairman, could generally be met here.

Although we enjoy an occasional display of wit and humor, the general attitude in the open forum leads me to believe that we would welcome anything that might remove from it the character of aimlessness, and thus tend to develop a serious discussion type of debate.

Very truly yours,

TERESINA MARINO, *Washington, Pa.*

SPEECH TRAINING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Dear Sir: The Committee for the Advancement of Speech Training in Secondary Schools believes the profession should know of the following activities of the Committee to date. This report includes only major and definite improvements. The credit belongs not merely to the Committee but to all the profession from which aid has come and must continue to come.

1. Over fifty educational magazines of state and national circulation have been supplied with convention accounts and information concerning the growth and advancement of speech training as well as benefits and results accruing therefrom.

2. Correspondence has been carried on with the editors of several of the prominent popular magazines of widest circulation, and friendly responses have been secured in every case. Several will devote editorials or articles to the advancement of secondary-school speech training.

3. A sixteen-page pocket-size pamphlet on "The School Curriculum and Speech Training" has been published. Over 1200 of these were distributed at the National Convention of Superintendents at Cleveland in February. The Chairman personally attended this Convention one day and made many helpful contacts. The response was most cordial.

4. Approximately 600 more of these pamphlets have been distributed to Parent-Teacher groups, and to various state educational leaders, through the cooperation of several members of the profession.

5. One member of the Committee seems to be nearing a solu-

tion of the problem of securing a national survey of the secondary-school speech situation. No announcement may yet be made.

6. The Director of the Michigan High School Debate League is completing such a survey in that state and will place the results at the disposal of the Committee.

7. Every effort has been made to cooperate with existent Speech Organizations of State and Sectional extent. Plans are nearing completion to arrange for organizations in those states yet unorganized and to provide for close coordination with the National Association.

8. The radio has been used, to a rather limited extent thus far, to advance the cause.

9. THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH has given cordial support.

10. The Business Manager of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL is cooperating in certain publicity.

11. The great limitations have been time and money matters. Among the many problems has been that of the rapidly increasing amount of correspondence thrust upon the Chairman and the Director of Publicity.

12. The Financial Director, ably presenting the cause, has secured support for the Committee, or promises of support, only from Iowa, Northwestern, and Syracuse universities.

It is obvious that no group of people on any Committee can finally attain the desired objectives. The Advancement of Speech Training in Secondary Schools deserves and needs the whole-hearted and active support of every member of a growing National Association. The Committee, as time goes on, must call upon an increasing number for specific aids. Volunteers may make the greatest contributions to the cause. Criticism will be most helpful, if it is given unreservedly *to the Committee.*

Respectfully submitted,

RUPERT CORTRIGHT, *Chairman*

THOMAS WILSON'S *ARTE OF RHETORIQUE*

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Dear Sir: Professor Sandford in the April JOURNAL calls attention in the first part of his letter to a slight injustice I may have done to a distinguished rhetorican by saying that we miss in Wilson "the logical means of persuasion."

Neither Wilson's mention of logic (nine times in all) in the *Rhetoric,* nor his having written a *Logic,* justify us in saying that his idea of rhetoric included the conception of logical means of persuasion. Wilson, when he wrote the *Logic* in 1551, thought of logic as argumentation and rhetoric as ornamentation. By 1553, when he wrote a *Rhetoric,* he had enlarged his conception to make it mean the art of discourse. He then—true to classical sources—suggested three ends of speaking, to teach, to delight, and to persuade. These do not, however, constitute a working outline for the book. And wherever persuasion is mentioned, he meant by it what he says in his definition on page 4: "moue the affections of his hearers"—in other words, emotional persuasion.

The revision of his conception of rhetoric did not extend to the inclusion of the logical methods of persuasion. A distinction between logic for argumentation and rhetoric for speaking well and fully was carefully preserved. In the passage Professor Sandford quotes this dichotomy is evident, for here Wilson announces that as far as proof goes, it is to be sought in logic, and that the orator should be well grounded in *logic* before he enters upon rhetoric. And so of the other instances when the logical means are mentioned, as: "... but because I haue spoken of similitudes heretofore in the booke of *Logique,* I will surcease to talke any further of this matter" (p. 190). "...and proue by large rehearsall any thing that wee would, the which of the *Logicians* is called induction" (p. 208).

When Wilson refers to the logical methods of proof he thinks of them as belonging to logic. They do not become conceptions of rhetoric at all, any more than the mention of the methods of the poets makes for a poetical conception in the *Rhetoric.*

To show the point of my statement in the JOURNAL, "We miss in Wilson a number of conceptions of classical rhetoric, notably the ethical and logical means of persuasion," let us suppose that Aristotle had said in the *Rhetoric* that the logical means are important, but that the speaker should be perfect in their use before attempting rhetoric, and that in any case, he would find them discussed in the logical works. Would Professor Sandford feel that this would constitute a working conception of logical persuasion in the *Rhetoric?*

On this basis it would be possible to find in Wilson's book

many conceptions which are not there. For example, although I have said that ethical persuasion is lacking, we find, pp. 101, 2: "We shall get the good willes of our hearers fower maner of waies, either beginning to speake of our selues... We shall get fauor for our owne sakes, if we shal modestly set foorth our bounden dueties and declare our seruice done, without all suspition of vaunting..." But to say that Wilson had a conception of ethical persuasion such as we find in the rhetorics of Aristotle or Quintilian, is wholly misleading. In studying the whole work, one inevitably concludes that he had no such conception, and that in the passage indicated he is simply giving a conventional method of beginning a speech.

Very truly yours,
RUSSELL H. WAGNER, *Cornell University*

TEXTBOOK WRITERS AND RESEARCHERS

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Dear Sir: "From more textbooks on public speaking, good Lord, deliver us!" exclaimed a colleague as he threw on my desk a copy of a new public-speaking textbook which he had just examined. This colleague attempts to read all the new textbooks in our field as they appear. In speaking of the newer books he said, "I've found only two which were not obviously written to flatter the author's vanity. Only two have really had anything to say that hasn't already been well said in older books."

And an examination of the preface of these books shows that by keeping silent on the matter, the authors have admitted that there was nothing which distinguished their book from the ones to which they acknowledge their indebtedness. Rather, these prefaces tell us the story of the great importance of public speaking in American life—which is not a justification for another book, if we operate on the theory that a new book should contain new ideas or an improved statement of old ideas.

It is too apparent that during the writing of our textbooks, too many of the authors had in mind the effect of their statements upon the academic minds of their colleagues rather than upon the minds of college sophomores. For what other reasons can we account for the extensive bibliographies which are now included in many of our elementary texts? The author must know, and surely

any wide-awake teacher knows, that much of the material listed in these bibliographies is more or less worthless and much more of it could be understood only by the instructor and that it would kill an interest in the topic rather than stimulate it *if* the reference *were* read by the student. It is obvious that *such* bibliographies are intended solely to impress colleagues with the author's scholarship.

In general, too much time is spent in classifying and quibbling about minutiae. This may pass away the time in a graduate seminar but it isn't of great value to our sophomore who is confronted with the problem of keeping his classmates awake while he attempts to make an assigned "expository" or "persuasive" talk. To ilustrate,—in one textbook intended for a one-semester, three-hour course for sophomores, the author discusses all the classifications of speech purposes from Aristotle to Phillips and Winans, shows how all these worthy gentlemen were mistaken, and finally gives one of his own. My point is that this bit of historical information may be of value in some courses, but in an undergraduate class which meets only forty-five times, the attention of the students and instructor can be given to other matters with greater profit to these youthful students.

Another fault with most textbooks is that they do not practice what they preach: they are not interesting; they discuss concreteness in the abstract; they do not present their material in a manner which is vivid enough to impress the student readers; the application of the theories to the actual public-speaking difficulties of the sophomore is not made clear. As a consequence, to the usual student, the public-speaking course consists of two parts: theory and practice—which have no relation to each other.

Yet another weakness is the devotion of too many pages to a pedantic discussion of voice. I have yet to see a student helped by reading a chapter on voice. A very few pages on voice should be quite adequate. Reading about the voice doesn't change it, because the reader can't criticize his own voice fairly. At a recent convention of our National Association one of the paper readers who was urging teachers to speak in an interesting, wide-awake manner, read to us for forty-five minutes in a deadening, monotonous, disinterested manner. Even writing about voice apparently has no more effect upon the writer than the reading of what he has to say has upon the reader.

A speech teacher went to one of our largest speech departments for his graduate work. His interest was in speech-making. He received his advanced degree in speech-making without ever having made a speech and without its being known by the department whether he ever had or ever could make one which would keep his hearers awake.

Instead, the would-be speaker made charts of vowel sounds and dug up musty volumes in libraries all over the country in order to gather useless information to catalogue, classify, and report in a deadening style of writing. After doing a good job at this clerical work he received his master's degree in public speaking!

The writer does not wish to depreciate the value of voice science and research in the least. They have their place; there is intelligent and valuable research; there is a place where one can make an intelligent use of voice science. But just to label a course "voice science" or "research" does not necessarily make the content of the course valuable. To illustrate,—one graduate student made a list of all topics discussed in eight of the most commonly used public speaking textbooks, counted the number of words devoted to each topic by each author, struck an average,—and found which was the best book on speechmaking! For this bit of work he received credit, a good grade in 'research," and the commendation of the head of the department. Was this foolishness valuable just because it was called "research?"

But why have we this emphasis on 'research?" Frankly, it is to impress faculty colleagues in other departments that we are "scholarly." We may "get away with it" for the time being, but surely, when our colleagues learn what we are doing under the name of research, their estimate of the value of the work of the speech department will not be heightened.

But why do we feel it *necessary* to *impress* our colleagues in other departments? It is because we do not command their respect as authorities in our field. We should be authorities in influencing human behavior, in so far as it can be influenced from the platform or stage. As a class, however, we are terrible public speakers and readers, as anyone who attends our national conventions knows. We cannot impress our colleagues by our ability to do the thing we are supposed to do so we substitute another goal for speech—and that is "research." The process works something

like this—we would like to sway the multitude; we cannot do it so we compensate by *teaching* public speaking. Realizing that we are not good public speakers we rationalize out of difficulty by substituting another ideal rather than by developing proficiency in speech.

Conditions are rather deplorable when no one thinks of asking a speech teacher to make a speech. What would we think of the probable value of the work of the music department, if when we wanted music for an affair it never occurred to anyone to call upon the music department? Or suppose when some problem in chemistry arose, people consulted not the Chemistry Department but some professor of History or English who studied chemistry as a hobby. Do you think that the prestige of the Chemistry Department would be helped by "research" involving a comparison of elementary textbooks on the subject?

As long as people in other departments are more proficient in speech than we people who teach it, we cannot command their respect. We may increase their respect by "research" *after* we demonstrate our ability *at least* to equal them in doing our own work, but until then it seems that it would be wise for our graduate schools to require proficiency in speech for an advanced degree in speech-making. And still if they did, they would be requiring of their students an ability which their teachers have not yet acquired!

Very truly yours,

H. A. H.

NEW BOOKS

[New Books are sent to staff reviewers, but voluntary contributions are gladly considered. Manuscripts should be sent to Hoyt H. Hudson, Review Editor, Princeton University.]

Equipment for Stage Production. By Arthur Edwin Krows. New York and London: D. Appleton and Company, 1928. $1.50.

Acting. A Book for the Beginner. By Allen Crafton and Jessica Royer. New York: F. S. Crofts, 1928. $2.25.

The Development of Dramatic Art. By Donald Clive Stuart. New York and London: D. Appleton and Company, 1928. $6.00.

Equipment for Stage Production, according to its author, is a sketch of principles involved in operating the world backstage. "It deals," says Mr. Krows, "with the especial world of the stage crew—probably the first book confined just to them.... What a splendid name for those who carry audiences in ships of illusion over seas of adventure!" The first page or two of this book, however, do not sound like a manual dedicated to a stage crew, as an imaginative picture is drawn of the playhouse when "the orchestra still plays the exit march, the curtain still quivers from its descent on the closing scene.... when players, bright-eyed from their recent exaltation, wander toward their dressing rooms picking their steps among the electricians' cables." But the author soon reaches his main problem of creating illusion in the "gloomy, cavernous shell" of the deserted stage, and after a brief historical survey of the theatre since the days of the Greeks, he is ready for the discussion of such topics as stage management, curtains, drops, borders, the box set, unit construction, elevations, lights, mechanical effects and the stage crew. The illustrations in this volume, many of them the result of Mr. Krow's work in the Winthrop Ames Little Theatre, are clear and accurate, and would be of real service to one who is in charge of building back stage equipment, particularly in a school theatre. These illustrations include removable curtains, overhead curtain riggings, flats, joinings and brac-

ings, mantels, step units, stairways, arches, columns, trees and rocks, weather effects, wagon and sliding stages and foreshortened perspective, and are, on the whole, more comprehensive than those which Mr. Andre Smith uses in *The Scenewright*. Barrett Clark's epithet for Mr. Krows—the Baedeker of the American theatre—is particularly applicable to this book which resembles both *Play Production in America* and *Playwriting for Profit* in its wealth of practical details simply and clearly explained.

Acting is a readable summary of some fundamental rules in amateur acting, considered both from the theoretical and the practical point of view, with emphasis upon the importance of a normal body, a good voice, personality, a theatrical sense and imagination. The most satisfactory part of the discussion is on the actor's major problem of character creation or what the authors call "creating a biography," on motivation for the uttering of every speech, on thinking in character. The theoretical analysis is strengthened by numerous examples, some of which would doubtless be beneficial to a student who did not have a rich background of experience or sufficient imagination from which to draw in his interpretation of a character unlike himself. Since the authors frankly state that their text deals with the craft of acting and that it cannot make an actor out of anybody, their text should help to create a saner attitude toward the function of the amateur actor, particularly in American colleges where too often indiscriminate praise has sent sophomoric Thespians with high hearts to the city, confident of their complete mastery of the "art" of acting. In fact, the attitude of the authors toward the amateur is intelligently sympathetic throughout. They believe that he is in no way inferior to the professional but that his field is an entirely separate one; they place considerable emphasis on the dignity of the function of the amateur in their historical survey of his work, notably in the Buddhistic moralities of the Hindus, the early miracle plays of England, and the dramatic performances sponsored by Hans Sachs in Germany.

More space could be devoted to the need of satisfactory reading of lines in amateur plays. The reference to Sarah Bernhardt's recipe for poise in walking,—"pretend that there is a fragrant, buoyant breeze at our backs, blowing against our shoulders"—is slightly fantastic. The inevitable comments on whether or not

the actor should feel the part he is playing lead to nothing more than Sir Roger de Coverley's verdict concerning the inn sign,—that much might be said on both sides. And the bibliography is not comprehensive. However, this book is a helpful record of the experience of sincere dramatic producers who realize the amateur's need for a better intellectual background, for a knowledge of the theatre and its arts. "Instruction and emotion are not enough; somebody has to do sound thinking and clear reasoning."

From the title and table of contents of Professor Stuart's book one might readily conclude that it is a history of dramatic art, for the chapter headings indicate Greek tragedy and comedy, Latin comedy, medieval drama, Italian and French Renaissance comedy and tragedy, French tragedy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, domestic drama, German drama of the eighteenth century French romantic and realistic drama, naturalistic drama, Hebbell and Ibsen, Russian drama, the new stagecraft, and expressionism. The road leads from *The Persians* to *Strange Interlude*. Yet, in the preface, the author states that this is not a history of dramatic art. "It is hoped," he says, "that the reader who follows the discussion to the end may obtain a clearer understanding of how and why dramatic art arose at the altar of Dionysus and developed into the many forms which thousands of people are witnessing at this moment." In fact, the impression gathered from reading this volume is that the author has a rare understanding of the art of playwriting and that he has at no point succumbed to a mere historical dramatic review. Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides all descend from their traditional pedestals to become sincere workers in the theatre, each seeking a more effective way to explain life through the stage. It rather warms the cockles of one's heart to view them so. One thinks of them in terms of the obligatory scene, of suspense, characterization, climax, the interaction of events and characters,—of all the tools of the dramatist, noting where they succeeded and where they failed. Further proof of the value of this discussion as an analysis of playwriting may be found in the criticism of the medieval play *Adam*. "... the quiet, peaceful opening; the foreshadowing; the gradual rise of the action so artistically shaded in ever-increasing intensity and emotion; the lyricism, not overshadowing the action and giving a touch of beauty; the insight into human nature; the tragic climax in which the woman

is exalted by her sin and man is crushed; the tenseness and power of the dialogue in the original language make this play worthy of production on any stage." The author speaks of Plautus' *Stichus* as a mosaic of loosely conneted episodes,—a criticism which can assuredly be made of some modern dramatic structure. He shows how Marlowe's use of the soliloquy and the aside resulted in failure to show character in relation to other personalities affected by the same events. He analyzes the problems of exposition and of causal sequence among the wordy playwrights of the Renaissance; and in the discussion of the Italian satirist Aretino, he formulates a rule which some modern satirsts, interested only in their own cleverness, would do well to follow. "To be a great dramatist," says Professor Stuart, "one must love humanity even with its faults and weaknesses.

There is a wealth of illustrative material in the discussion of the dramatic technique of each dramatist, and brief, vivid summaries of the action of plays used to demonstrate generalities. On the whole, this volume on dramatic art is an unusual combination of understanding and of scholarship. It is invaluable as a preliminary to a course in playwriting which aspires to produce something other than the startling and the devastating, and as a piece of thorough research, it is a stimulus to those who believe that the play is the thing and always has been since the days of Dionysus. Professor Stuart has proved himself to be the true historian of dramatic art by his closing sentence in which he looks into the future and sees those who will smile with kindly indulgence at our dramatic technique even as we sometimes smile at those who have preceded us. It is this kind of perspective which lifts this volume above neat, historical classification and leaves an unexpressed challenge to future playwrights who may find an account of their heritage in these pages.

DOROTHY KAUCHER, *University of Missouri*

Fallodon Papers. By VISCOUNT GREY OF FALLODON, K. G., Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1926; pp. vi, 167.

Three years have slipped by since Lord Grey gave us this collection of his non-political speeches. The book has been widely read and commented upon. It is litle wonder that the speeches have provoked much discussion and abundant eulogy; for the

subjects treated, the vigor and charm of the speaker's thoughts, expressed in a style of bewildering simplicity, serve to capture the immediate attention and admiration of the reader.

Last year a German professor from the University of Breslau, came to the United States to deliver a course of lectures in one of our large colleges. He had not spoken publicly in English heretofore, and was faced with the problem of holding an American audience. He searched out a number of books to aid him in his preparation; among them he included the *Fallodon Papers*. He admitted to us that this volume of Lord Grey's speeches had proved to be more real help than most of his other reading put together. For he found in them a model of dignified English prose, spoken by a man who appeared to understand fully the psychology and taste of an English-speaking audience.

Truly, Lord Grey has been described as "the fine gentleman in speech," and assuredly, one comes away from reading this book with the feeling that he has "listened in" to a gentleman conversing. Austerity, and a coldness "which cuts and nips like sleet," have been offered as criticisms of Lord Grey's speaking. Maybe his political addresses warrant such characterization, yet in these *occasional* speeches, there is nothing to be called unsympathetic or austere. One gathers that the statesman is at play, enjoying a holiday environment which he loves. Incidentally, all the papers were prepared wholly or mainly at Fallodon, Lord Grey's country home, and they contain much that owes its origin to reflection, observation, or experience in home or holiday life.

Lord Grey would scarcely subscribe to the idea, held by so many, that the gift of speech is the passport to leadership—especially political leadership—in a present-day democracy. He contends that, though for public life a certain gift of speech is necessary, the man with character and understanding of human problems will win in the end, as against the man with remarkable gifts of speech but deficient in character or real ability of thought and understanding. Neither has he any sympathy with the abuse of politicians; he vigorously affirms that the people get from the politicians what they deserve. Again, he utters a word of caution. Democracy may set too high a premium upon the gift of public speaking. The public man becomes interesting by the gift of public speaking, and we are apt to overestimate people through admiration of the ex-

cellence of their speech. Cogency of language, as we listen to it, makes us feel that there must be behind it knowledge, firmness, a lofty moral purpose . . . "but it does not follow that those things are behind the gift of speech."

Neither would Lord Grey place any value upon political literature or speeches which tend to under-estimate the mental or moral level of the community. Such speeches do not get a sincere response from democracy: it would appear that a great response is given only to an appeal to the higher and not the lower instincts and feelings of the community. This idea, Lord Grey tells us, was brought to his mind with even more conviction by his friendship with Ambassador Walter H. Page. "If a democracy, such as the United States, did not respond to a great appeal, Mr. Page's view was, not that the appeal was above their heads, but that the appeal had not been lofty enough."

In his address "Recreation," delivered at the Harvard Union on December 8, 1919, Lord Grey pays a warm tribute to Theodore Roosevelt. He relates most whimsically an incident in Mr. Roosevelt's visit to England. The two men spent a day together in the country, listening to the songs of the English birds. Both men were lovers of birds, and of the out-of-doors. Both men loved the poetry of Wordsworth, and spent part of their day's tramp together, capping quotations from the great nature poet. To the reviewer, this episode is decidedly interesting, for one recalls how many speakers have cherished Wordsworth as their favorite poet—Roosevelt, Lord Grey, Lord Morley, Premier Stanley Baldwin. These men have quoted Wordsworth profusely in their writings and speeches. Perhaps this poet; his themes, his metaphors, his similes, and the exquisite simplicity of his language had special appeal to these men, who as speakers, found it necessary to grip the human understanding and imagination of their audiences.

We find in this collection of speeches, several salient observations on method in rhetorical style and speech preparation. Professor Jowett once advised a man, when writing, to read his manuscript carefully and to strike out anything that struck him as being particularly fine. Lord Grey considers that you could not apply that to public speaking: nobody would listen. . . . "It is legitimate, with most of us it is even necessary, that in our speeches there should be a certain amount of concertina playing,

(passages that sound particularly fine) if we are fortunate enough to have any gift for playing it." Lord Grey's own procedure for the preparation of long speeches was, first to write them carefully and then read from a manuscript. So far as the Fallodon addresses are concerned, impaired sight was unequal to this performance. There was therefore no original manuscript: each address was prepared mentally and delivered orally like an extemporaneous speech, with the use of very few notes or no notes at all. A *verbatim* report was made by a shorthand writer and revised for the purpose of being printed. Lord Grey feels, however, that no amount of revision can quite smooth away the roughness of expression and arrangement that is inseparable from oral delivery of an address that is not read from manuscript and is too long to be committed to memory.

These are the subjects of the addresses in the *Fallodon Papers:* the Pleasure of Reading, Pleasure in Outdoor Nature, Recreation, Some Thoughts on Public Life, Waterfowl at Fallodon, the Fly-Fisherman, and an Interpretation of Wordsworth's "Prelude." It is a delightful summer book for readers of the QUARTERLY. It can be read and re-read. The practical minded will find within these pages something that can be used in class during the Autumn Semester; impractical people, like ourself, will revel with the author in an open-air vacation at Fallodon. For Lord Grey's utterances are like the cool, pleasant things of nature; his style is like a fountain "which sends up its cooling waters into the warm air, or like a stream which flows quietly through the fields."

ROBERT HANNAH, *Hunter College*

Teaching Speech in the Elementary School: A comparative study of speech education in the elementary schools of England and the United States. BY EMMA GRANT MEADER. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928, pp. 129.

Mrs. Meader has made a comprehensive survey of the literature of the field, and has supplemented that by questionnaires and personal investigation here and in England. "Part one aims to define the term 'good speech' and to describe the attitude toward it both in England and America. Part two sets forth the place, function, and status quo of speech education in the public schools of the

United States. Part three sets forth the place, function, and status quo of speech education in the elementary schools of England. Part four comprises a constructive program for speech education in the elementary and normal schools of the United States."

The comparison of the English and American conception of speech training is significant and enlightening. In her discussion of high schools Mrs. Meader seems to have overlooked the report edited by A. M. Drummond entitled *Speech Training and Public Speaking for Secondary Schools.* The bibliography, with a few exceptions, is comprehensive, and the general conception of speech training and its function make the study an important one for school administrators and all teachers of speech. It should be especially useful in summer courses for teachers.

E. L. H.

Persuasive Speaking. By John A. McGee. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929; pp. x, 300.

This book is intended as an elementary text on persuasive speaking, which is defined by the author as "that address which seeks to induce belief or action." Many teachers, however, will hardly agree that an elementary text should concentrate upon the persuasive speech to the neglect of other fundamental matters which need to be covered. The difficulty is that the author is assuming at the outset that all speaking is persuasive. He says in effect that the problem of every man who speaks is to gain acceptance of new plans. In discussing the nature of the speaker's problem, he says, "Behind nearly every utterance, unless it be made purely for the sake of amusement, it is the intent of the author to have his listeners follow a certain course of action."

The chief contribution of the book and its point of departure from other texts is in the statement of the task of the speaker who would persuade. This lies in a new method of organizing a persuasive speech designated as the *motivating process.* According to this the speaker gains his end always by (1) securing attention, (2) stating a problem, (3) offering a solution, (4) visualizing its desirability, (5) inviting definite action. The terms introduction, body and conclusion are discarded and in their stead is offered a formula for carrying out the above steps which the author would apply to every speech, viz: (1) attention step, (2) problem step,

(3) solution step, (4) visualization step, and (5) action step. While this order may not seem to be a new one, the outline suggested which places the development of each step in a block by itself will serve to call the attention of the student vividly to each step in the process. The author advocates making first a full sentence outline and then reducing it to key-words. He suggests the "block outline" which is simply using the key-word outline and blocking off each division or step by drawing lines around it and labeling it.

This formula is all very well when applied to certain speeches and may serve to give the student a good guide. Where the author and I part company is where he attempts to stretch it to cover all speeches. An attempt is even made to apply these steps in the organizing process to special types of speeches like the after-dinner speech, the speech of introduction and the speech of welcome. Conkling's speech nominating Grant is printed as illustration of the formula, but this speech, it seems to me, is an exceptional instance which happens to fit. This attempt to fit all speech into the persuasive mold and the concentration on the technique of this form makes the book appear one-sided. For an elementary text this neglects the fundamentals of speech and concentrates too much upon a phase which is usually taken up at a later time. The matters of delivery, language and style in speech, collecting and organizing material are superficially treated. But for the speech which aims for action particularly, the chapters on *The Problem Step* and *The Solution Step* are good and will be helpful to the student. The chapter on *Motivating Action* may confuse him. In it are listed twenty-two motives to which the speaker may appeal. This makes too great a tax on the memory. Between many of them, too, there is little difference and to organize them under a few outstanding motives would render them less confusing.

As far as the style is concerned much of the book is written below the intellectual level of the college student. The chief impression it leaves is that of immaturity. The language is clear and simple, but often too simple. The succession of short, simple sentences used so freely in the first part of the book produces a monotony which may become very annoying to the reader. The last part, however, has more variety of style and seems less elementary.

The author makes a point of getting away from the separate treatment of delivery and alternates the chapters on delivery with other chapters. To me this was confusing for after reading a chapter on delivery I had to read one on the attention step, then two more on delivery, then back to the next step in the organizing process. These chapters can just as well be placed together. There are several points in the treatment of delivery which are likely to be disputed. The author constantly speaks of *transferring* thought and feeling. He discards the term *gesture* and then talks about hand and arm movements, but later falls back on the use of the term in quotation marks to indicate these movements. He goes back to the old classification into three levels of gesture. The whole treatment of delivery is too general to be of much value.

Persuasive Speaking is well printed and attractively bound. To my mind it can be best used as supplementary to other material. Its advice particularly on the solution step and the problem step will be of help to the student in the work of constructing a speech the purpose of which is to persuade.

CHARLES A. FRITZ, *New York University*

Essay Backgrounds for Writing and Speaking. Edited by ANTHONY F. BLANKS. New York: Scribner's, 1929, pp. 378.

Thought and Its Expression. Edited by G. C. CLANCY. New York: Harcourt, Brace; 1928, pp. 260.

Further Adventures in Essay Reading. Edited by THOMAS RANKIN, AMOS MORRIS, MELVIN SOLVE, AND CARLETON WELLS. New York: Harcourt, Brace; 1928, pp. 582.

Essays in Liberal Thought. Edited by W. H. THOMAS AND STEWART MORGAN. New York: Harcourt, Brace; 1928, pp. 574.

Models and Values. Edited by WALTER PHILLIPS, WILLIAM CRANE, AND FRANK R. BYERS. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 528.

Unless publishers are turning philanthropists, the increasing number of books of selected readings for courses in writing and speaking indicates a growing belief in a method of teaching which relies largely upon suggestion and stimulation. Students are not usually examined upon these books, nor are they expected to reproduce the material in their speeches or compositions. The in-

tention is rather the suggestion of problems and projects, and the establishment of the intellectual level of treatment. Various educational purposes and beliefs are reflected in these compilations. Some editors emphasize the atmosphere of freedom essential to creative effort, and, apparently without plan, include anything that may be expected to interest the undergraduate. Let a student write or speak anything under heaven, they say, if only he will be alive and enthusiastic about it. Some seem to believe that the best preparation for writing short stories and orations is to read model stories and orations. Others regard this as sterile, resulting in merely bookish and literary imitations; these editors prefer to present the raw material for such productions; they incline to historical, sociological, and philosophical material rather than literary models and criticism. Some plan their volumes as an orientation to college life; others believe that students are already too collegiate, and would have attention directed away from the campus. They desire to initiate the student into the republic of letters, or into contemporary thought, or even into public affairs. The chief danger of all these volumes is that, representing occasionally the compilers' rather than the students' interests, they may encourage a premature and superficial handling of abstractions. Their merit is that, as is said in one way or another in most of the prefaces, technique is made the instrument of the thought and purpose of the student. This belief that technique should be subordinated does not come from any metaphysical or aesthetic opinion about the relation of form and substance, but is a practical pedagogical conclusion that technical skill in writing and speaking is best developed by a certain indirection, and that technical advice should be administered in doses as needed, and not presented as systematic instruction.

A familiarity with the realm of opinion presented in these books should enable an instructor to stimulate students of diverse interests and abilities. A whole library of such volumes, of course, would not equip a scholar; but we are here concerned with pedagogy, not scholarship. Scholarship is necessary for the creation of a healthy scepticism concerning the rhetorical generalizations in which the literature of opinion abounds, but scholarship is as disastrous for some teachers as a good voice for some actors. In spite of all needed warnings about a lack of solid scholarly procedure,

about easy generalizations, superficial observations, and the dangers of journalism and rhetoric, these books are collecting for us much of the stimulating thought and opinion of the times.

Professor Blanks introduces his selections with valuable essays upon speech preparation and discussion. He then launches into biographical inquiry, political and social inquiry, literary and critical inquiry, religious inquiry, and philosophical inquiry. Presumably his emphasis upon inquiry is to indicate that these essays represent merely the beginning of wisdom, and that the end is yet far off. His main topics are representative of permanent interests for the writer and speaker and the essays and addresses justify their inclusion in such a collection. The scheme of study in the introduction is sound, and the appended reading lists are suggestive.

Professor Clancy calls his *Thought and Its Expression* a course in thinking and writing for college students. His topics are: the life of the mind; standards, taste, and the place of the critic; freedom of thought, liberty of the individual, rule of the majority, democracy; the idea of progress, the old and the new, the search for the enduring good. Professor Clancy has edited his essays severely in the interest of brevity; many of his selections take only one or two pages. He has skillfully juxtaposed them for the purpose of stimulating argument, and has appended to each section topics for themes and discussions, suggestions for more extended study, and reading lists. Such a book is clearly more of a "starter" than a book of models. The pointedness and brevity of its selections will commend it to many.

The plan of *Further Adventures in Essay Reading* is not immediately apparent. The essays are largely contemporary, are more definitely literary, but will provide many subjects of philosophical, sociological, and educational discussion. Aside from the orief introductions the editors have dispensed with apparatus.

Essays in Liberal Thought leaves the reader in doubt as to the editors' conception of liberal thought, but that may not be a weakness. The essays are contemporary, interesting, and significant. An appendix of questions and topics is included.

The selection of materials in *Models and Values* is distinctive; the volume has both a theory and a plan. Its discussions are "designed to exemplify the mental temper and prevailing point of view

in our day. The book of models has doubtless come to stay, but fifteen years in which it has been the chief reliance of composition courses indicates that it is no panacea. It has possibly stimulated ideas; it has not produced literacy. The weakness of the model-method has perhaps been that it has cherished ideas, so-called, at the expense of the art of writing." The selections are arranged under three headings: elements of narrative, materials in literary criticism, and contemporary points of view. At least half the volume is devoted to what might be termed questions in public discussion. All the material is of distinguished quality.

EVERETT HUNT, *Swarthmore College*

The Little Library of Self-Starters. By ROBERT R. UPDEGRAFF. Chicago: A. W. Shaw Company, 1929; six volumes, $4.

There seems still to be be a public which reads sermons. But the religion preached has changed, since the days of Sherlock, Tillotson, Chalmers, and Spurgeon. The present attractively printed collection consists of sermons, or tracts, based upon the religion of success. Salvation (from commercial failure) is guaranteed to the devout, that is, to those who study the law and the prophets, who work, and especially who advertise.

The titles of the six volumes in this set are: "A New Bag of Tricks for Every Business," "Old Specification," "The New American Tempo," "The Sixth Prune," "Obvious Adams," and "The Subconscious Mind in Business." They are to be recommended to all who have occasion to speak before commercial men, or who teach such men. Here are the commonplaces of up-to-the-minute thinking in the business world. The fact that the author assumes that the business world is the only real one need not interfere with one's profitable reading. Here also are anecdotes and illustrations which any speaker might use or adapt. The power of rhetoric is enforced by such statements as this: "The Makers of a fine-tooth comb recently rejuvenated their business by advertising their comb as a 'dry shampoo comb'." The following list of words, contributed by Mr. S. L. Rothafel as containing the secret of successful theatrical entertainment, may prove suggestive to those of us who try to isolate "factors of interestingness": "style, color, change, light, brevity, contrast, sweep, motion."

They overlap, and some are indefinable,—just as in texts on public speaking.

The chief consolation left with an academic reader of these pronouncements from a priest of the modern church militant lies in the position assigned to "the public." In this religion, the public is God; mysterious, with "ways past finding out," it is the public which must be propitiated, cajoled, obeyed. The priests (advertising men and writers of tips to business people) claim, as of old, a special knowledge of the god's attributes and whims. To be sure, this is a god that can be fooled quite a bit; it is not omniscient, but it is omnipotent—in the sense that it has all the desirable money. All of us, even teachers, I take it, are part of this public, whose favor is so important, whose indifference is so damning. But I fear that, as has happened before, we are a god which the priests have made in their own image.

HOYT H. HUDSON, *Princeton University*

Practical Speech-Making: the Extempore Method. BY EDWIN DUBOIS SHURTER AND CHARLES ALMER MARSH. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1929; pp. vi, 248; $1.60.

This orderly and interesting book confines itself, except for ten pages devoted to delivery, to *preparation* for extemporaneous speaking. The authors take over as their central definition these words from Buckley's *Extemporaneous Oratory:* "Extemporaneous oratory . . . is: The delivery, in an arrangement of words, sentences, and paragraphs, entirely the birth of the occasion, of ideas previously conceived and adopted with more or less fullness and precision, together with such thoughts and feelings as may arise and obtain utterance." Prominent contemporary speakers, such as Frank O. Lowden, Henry van Dyke, David Starr Jordan, Henry J. Allen, and Carter Glass, sent to Professors Shurter and Marsh hearty testimony to their preference for the method of preparation so indicated.

Aside from the correspondence of these gentlemen and some fresh illustrative material, *Practical Speech-Making* offers nothing that is new; but the old advices receive another wording, and a fairly wide reading in modern rhetorical literature has yielded apt quotations. All five of Phillips' general ends are taken over,

though with some change of names. In certain chapters the authors are plainly adapting from Winans. The sainted Richard Jebb appears twice on p. 40 as "Professor Jedd," though the correct name in the Index shows this form to be a misprint. Isaeus, however, is consistently spelled "Iseaus." "Professor A. Parker Nevin of Princeton University," who "has recently written" the very clever speech for all occasions on pp. 4-5, was never a professor at Princeton or elsewhere, but was a distinguished attorney who died in 1926. These slips are not momentous, however; and we may leave the book as we found it—orderly and interesting.

HOYT H. HUDSON, *Princeton University*

OLD BOOKS

The Theory of Preaching. By Austin Phelps. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1882.

A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons. By John A. Broadus. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1870; 23d edition, revised and edited by E. C. Dargan, 1898.

Bishop Bashford, whose praise of Brook's *Yale Lectures on Preaching* led this page in the April Quarterly, presumably knew both of the works named above. I cannot but think that he was forgetting Broadus, at least, when he applied the superlative to Brooks.

Phelps, in his Preface, distinguished between the scientific and the practical treatment of his subject:

> By the one, homiletics . . . is developed chiefly by scientific analysis and in its relation to kindred sciences. The resulting treatise is valuable to a student mainly as a means of mental discipline. It would be formed, ultimately, on the model of Aristotle's system of rhetoric. By the other method, homiletics . . . would form a treatise valuable to a student chiefly as a practical guide and help to the work of the pulpit.

Phelps chose the practical approach; he may have chosen it because Broadus, before him, leaned to the scientific. Each writer excels in his kind.

As might be inferred, then, *The Theory of Preaching* offers the spicier reading. However, it also contains more material which is applicable only to the task of the preacher. It is a mine of illustrations, and of crisp direct statements of rhetorical principles. Set down, as it is, from the author's lectures, an oral style quickens its pages. A specimen will illustrate:

> Why did such events as the burning of the "Lexington," the wreck of the "Arctic," the duel between the "Merrimack" and the "Monitor," and the conflagrations at Chicago and Boston start up all over the land discussions of the doctrine of a special Providence? Not only in pulpits and prayer-meetings, but in secular newspapers, in magazines, in railway-cars, in steamboats, at coro-

ner's inquests, and at tea-tables, within three months after each of those events, men wrote and talked enough on the doctrine of Providence to make up the sermons of a life-time. Goethe tells us that a similar state of things all over Europe followed the earthquake at Lisbon. Was it dull talking and stale reading? Did men go to sleep over it? Why not? Simply because it was religious doctrine born into real life, and reproduced in living speech. Men felt the need of it; and they gave and took it in the forms of real life.... Infidelity will outstrip orthodoxy in any community, sooner or later, if all the electric force seems to be given over to error, and truth has to bear all the dead and dying and decaying things of civilized life, and to struggle through the consequent mephitic vapors.... The Holy Spirit does not work miracles to give success to dullness.

Yet in spite of Phelps's "practical" counsels, and stimulating, timely, "inspirational" style, the cooler scientific work of Broadus has worn longer and spread its influence more widely. I cannot help thinking that *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* is one of the three or four best rhetorical studies ever made by Americans. It is probably the only one which has been translated into Chinese, Japanese, and Portuguese. In 1926 Doran's brought out the forty-second edition, with a revised bibliography and a preface by A. T. Robertson, but with no other changes.

In Broadus you will not find references to recent conflagrations and steamship disasters. He works *sub specie aeternitatis*, having accepted and mastered the rhetorical tradition. He had been accustomed to use Whately's *Rhetoric* as a text-book; hence it is not strange that his foot-notes reveal forty-five references to that book, and several others to Whately's *Logic*. They also show fifteen references to Quintilian, fifteen to Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, thirteen to Cicero (including references to five different works), and eleven to Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. Some of these references stand for more or less extensive quotations. There are not many alive to-day who could move through the works of the masters so surefootedly as does Broadus.

He also knew out-of-the-way writers on his subject. On the delivery of Burke, he sends the reader to a passage in Bulwer's *Caxtoniana* which should establish once for all that Burke was capable of excellent oratorical delivery. I quote from Bulwer be-

cause the point has often been raised, and I believe the passage is not well known:

It may be true that he [Burke] had an untunable voice—a strong brogue—an ungainly gesture; but I think I can cite proof sufficient to show that Burke's *delivery*, in spite of its defects, was that of an orator—that is to say, it was a delivery which increased, not diminished, the effect of his matter. Mr. Fox, in the last motion he ever made in the House of Commons, thus, in words which have escaped the notice of those who have discussed the question of Burke's merits as an orator, refers to a speech of Burke's upon the abolition of negro slavery: "It was, perhaps, the most brilliant and convincing speech ever delivered in this or any other place by a consummate master of eloquence, and of which, I believe, there remains in some publications a report that will convey an inadequate idea of the substance, though it would be impossible to represent the *manner*—the voice, the gesture, the manner was not to be described—O, si illum audisse, si illum vidisse!"

Now, as many must then have been present, by whom Burke's delivery would have been familiarly known, it is clear that a man of Fox's sound taste and sense would never have indulged in a compliment, not only to the matter but still more emphatically to the *manner* of the departed statesman, had it not been recognized as truthful. If the matter had been really marred by the defects of delivery, Fox's cordial praise would have seemed malignant irony.

But Broadus's work is not merely a compilation of passages from earlier writers. It is a thorough treatise undertaken by one who felt the responsibility of mastering his subject before he wrote. Its great defect is its omission of a section devoted to analysis of the audience.

What has been the influence of Phelps and Broadus?

Here is a work on rhetoric which has been taught in scores of institutions for nearly three-score of years. And rhetoric is supposed to be an engine of power. Has the book imparted any power to its students? Well, Dr. Broadus was a teacher at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Ask that professional observer of American life, H. L. Mencken, whether the students of that Seminary have wielded any power in the past two generations. Ask the Association against the Eighteenth Amendment whether the readers of Phelps and Broadus have had any influence.

HOYT H. HUDSON, *Princeton University*

Contemporary Speeches

[Contributions for this department should be sent to V. E. Simrell, Dartmouth College.]

PRESIDENT HOOVER: *Inaugural Address.* March 4, 1929.

Perhaps it is fortunate that the country is allowed four months for sober reflection from the time it registers its choice for the highest executive office until its chosen leader is called upon to outline his policies and to assume his duties. Within that time animosities of an excited campaign cease to become the center of attention, and the minority in some measure becomes reconciled to its defeat.

In this instance even the minority has some confidence in the man selected: enough to entertain the hope that the affairs of the country will not be foolishly administered. This hope rests largely upon the unusually broad experience which President Hoover brings to his new task and upon the success which he has won in various fields. On the other hand, a conservative engineer could not be expected to satisfy the demands of all shades of liberals and radicals seeking changes in everything from our Latin-American policy to prohibition and the development of hydro-electric power. His opening address does not increase the confidence of those opposed to the traditional Republican policies. His inaugural falls far short of what we might expect of a statesman.

The President begins his speech with a reference to the importance of the occasion and of the office which he is assuming. Then, after three short paragraphs devoted to our prestige and attainments in recent years during the administration of Calvin Coolidge, he asserts: "But all this majestic advance should not obscure the constant dangers from which self-government must be safe-guarded."

The first of these dangers is the disregard and disobedience of law, which have resulted not alone from the difficulties of prohibition, but also from the faults of our whole judicial procedure. The latter can be improved through reorganization and reform, but

the former call for the help of every individual citizen. "The duty of citizens to support the laws of the land," says the President, "is co-equal with the duty of their government to enforce the laws which exist." If we are to have any protection of life and property in the long run, we cannot select certain laws to obey and others to disobey, especially when disobedience directly supports a criminal and lawless class. "If citizens do not like a law," the President declares, "their duty as honest men and women is to discourage its violation; their right is openly to work for its repeal." In order to determine the best methods of effecting necessary changes, a national commission will be asked to make a searching investigation of the whole structure of our Federal system of jurisprudence, as well as the method of enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment and the causes of abuse under it.

The President interprets his election as popular approval of government regulation of private enterprise as opposed to government ownership and operation. Business prosperity, he believes, depends upon free competition in those industries which produce and distribute commodities, and upon regulation of services and rates in monopolistic public utilities. He advocates the full cooperation of the government with business in solving all its problems, from efficiency and stability to employment and abuses. This same cooperation should extend to all the agencies affecting education and public health.

In introducing his discussion of our relations to other countries, President Hoover makes a contention which many of us will not be able entirely to accept: "The whole world is at peace. The dangers to a continuation of this peace today are largely the fear and suspicion which still haunt the world. No suspicion or fear can be rightly directed toward our country." I hope we all realize how blameless our conduct always is. The President's supporting observations seem unconvincing. To say that Americans are so engrossed in building up their own country that they have no thought of imperialism is to overlook our need of raw materials and markets in unadvanced countries, for that very development. Is it not better to admit our imperialistic tendencies and then to show the reasons for them than to deny that from which we cannot escape?

The President offers to the world, without reference to our

increasing number of cruisers, a proposal for greater limitation of armament, and contends that we should support every sound method of conciliation, arbitration, and judicial settlement. He believes that a way will be found for us to enter the World Court. Our unwillingness to become a member of the League of Nations the President explains as a conviction that the independence of America from such obligations increases its ability and availability for services in all fields of human progress. This idea is vague, and quite at variance with the President's justification for cooperation within our own country. We may cooperate among ourselves, but not with other people.

For our neighbors in this hemisphere we desire only the maintenance of independence, the growth of stability, and prosperity. President Hoover maintains that the New World is largely free from the inheritance of fear and distrust which have so troubled the Old War and that we should keep it so.

After an emotional appeal for peace, the President declares: "I covet for this administration a record of having further contributed to advance the cause of peace." No specific course of action is outlined; only the usual generalities are held out to us.

The rest of the speech is even more vague and general than the discussion of foreign affairs. Nearly all of the political platitudes of our language find a place somewhere in this address. Except in his treatment of law enforcement, President Hoover is abstract or indefinite, and even there he is disappointing. Probably the *Baltimore Sun* is right in classing this inaugural address among the second or third grade of such speeches.

WILBUR E. GILMAN, *University of Missouri*

PRESIDENT HOOVER: *Message to Congress.* April 16, 1929.
NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, Speaker of the House of Representatives: *Opening Address.* April 15.

How to speed up Congress is a problem of interest to the entire commonwealth, and the technique thereof extends far beyond the limits of rhetorical criticism. It is the major problem of both the President's message and Speaker Longworth's inaugural remarks. The former deals with it implicitly, the latter explicitly; both depend more upon example than upon exhortation. Brevity

is the most conspicuous quality of both compositions. It may well be that in most situations he argues best who argues least, and certainly where there is important work to be done as the result of discussion the most effective argument is the one that concentrates discussion instead of expanding it.

In his first sentence Mr. Hoover commits his authority both as newly elected President and as leader of his party to the limitation of debate. "I have called this special session of Congress to redeem two pledges given in the last election—farm relief and limited changes in the tariff." A heavily Republican Congress is quite likely both to give heed to such a direct "mandate of the people" and to do what it can to support the party leader's campaign pledges. At least no other appeal from the President could be more persuasive.

From a member of Congress, however, there is a still stronger appeal for concentration, and one not limited to either party. Speaker Longworth recalls Congresses "which have drifted along throughout the summer, even into the dog days of September," and warns the House, "I speak from experience when I say that legislation framed in a temperature of ninety degrees is not apt to be good legislation." He was applauded at this point, and deservedly. It sounds better to say that hot weather is bad for legislation than to say that it is bad for legislators, but the point is not lost.

Intelligent concentration of discussion requires something more, however, than either authoritative demand or appeal to common sense or self-interest. It requires chiefly a clear outline of the matter to be discussed. To define the limits of a subject, so as to include all the territory covered by it, but so as to reserve details, however interesting or important in themselves, which belong within that territory, is perhaps the best means of controlling argument and the most difficult art of exposition. It is easy for anyone to see that an outline map of the United States leaves out the Rocky Mountains but not the Florida peninsula. It is not so easy to discriminate, in public discourse, between material which is part of the interior economy of the subject and that which defines its boundaries. Wilson and Bryan never managed it, Roosevelt did sometimes, Lincoln and Webster were masters of the art. Mr. Hoover's message is very successful in suppressing unnecessary details, rather less successful in covering all the territory. It has

consequently provoked a certain amount of criticism of its omissions, which retards debate instead of accelerating it. Mr. Longworth's address is still further foreshortened, but at least is as inclusive. The Speaker erred rather in introducing certain unnecessary and provocative discussion. Most conspicuous was his assertion in regard to the tariff that "The line of cleavage between the two great political parties would seem to have crumbled in the past few years almost to questions of detail." Promptly a Southern Democratic Representative made a speech of denial, which Mr. Longworth would probably have done better never to have tempted from the party caucus to the House.

Although the evident deliberative purpose of the two addresses is primarily to concentrate and expedite discussion of the problems of farm relief and the tariff, it may be considered that they are really occasional rather than deliberative speeches. Of course it was the opening of the special session of Congress which brought both into existence, and the first part of Mr. Longworth's address is purely occasional, appropriate but quite conventional patter concerning the office to which he had just been elected. The latter part of his speech, however, and the whole of the President's message are so completely concerned with the business in hand that the occasion is lost in the subject of deliberation. A more important reason for considering them both essentially epideictic is the probability that neither was actually intended to influence Congress: the President's views had been completely explained before the message was delivered, Mr. Longworth's remarks merely echoed the Administration's policy, and the Republican majority was already quite adequately organized in support of their conclusions. But both addresses did put their makers conspicuously on record, identifying them with the program for which the special session had been called, and displaying, not rhetorical art or personal feeling, but intelligent responsibility for the party's campaign pledges.

The style of Mr. Longworth's address is very much more intimate than the President's, but certainly no more representative of the man, and both are altogether appropriate to the occasion. The Speaker is as interesting as a man could be in summarizing a program of tariff and farm-relief legislation, and the President is as sober as a man should be in obeying the Constitutional mandate that "He shall from time to time give to Congress information of

the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." Not many people will enjoy reading the message, for it is even duller than Mr. Hoover's campaign speeches, but it is altogether to Mr. Hoover's credit that he has, in his public utterances, so consistently shunned the example of the Chinese emperor who died of an overdose of the elixir of life.

V. E. SIMRELL, *Dartmouth College*

THE REED-BORAH DEBATE ON THE JONES BILL. *Congressional Record.* Vol. 70, Nos. 58, 59, and 68, part 2; Feb. 18, 19, and Mar. 1, 1929.

The recent clash between Senator James A. Reed and Senator William E. Borah in the Senate over the Jones amendment to the national prohibition act has been regarded by many as one of the great debates of American history. The inevitable comparison has been made to the Webster-Hayne and the Lincoln-Douglas debates. Since both Reed and Borah long have been regarded the outstanding orators of the Senate, a meeting of the two men upon a topic so vital to both was certain to result in a forensic display of no ordinary nature. Interest was further heightened by the knowledge that the speech probably would be Reed's last major effort before his permanent retirement from the Senate and, unless he attempts the heroic tack of running for president in 1932, from public life. Surely, then, the scene was set for the "great debate" of the century.

But, unfortunately, those who compare the resulting contest to the Webster-Hayne debate are as extravagant in their praise as they were justified in their expectations. It was not one of the outstanding debates of American history. There are many reasons why it was not. The most obvious reason is, of course, that it could scarcely be called a debate at all, inasmuch as Reed spoke without knowing that he would be answered immediately by Borah and without extended reference to Borah's peculiar views concerning prohibition. It is true that Borah in his turn did make a detailed answer to Reed's charges but the rules of the Senate prevented rebuttals by either man, and the discussion was continued—often, it is true, brilliantly—by Senators Blaine, Edge, Bruce, Heflin, Brookhart, Shepperd, Capper, and others. It is

indeed unfortunate for the records of debate that Reed and Borah were not permitted to continue the discussion. What might not have resulted! A year ago the department of speech of a mid-western university endeavored to match the two in a public debate on prohibition, but were unable to do so because of other engagements of the Senators. Another attempt at the present time might be more successful. Other departments of speech might well consider the advisability of sponsoring debates between men both prominent in public life and possessing admirable speaking manners. Such contests, especially if accompanied by radio hook-ups, would stimulate interest in public speaking, debating, and persuasive methods.

But, despite the incomplete nature of the recent Borah-Reed debate, it should be studied by every teacher of public speaking and argumentation. Senator Reed's speech is, of its type, a masterpiece. Few orators in modern time can compare with Reed in the skillful use of invective. In this recent speech his denunciation of hypocrisy, official corruption, and organized bigotry is both audacious and effective. He achieves a vividness, a directness, and a fiery boldness surely as powerful in its cumulative effect as that of any speaker who has ever addressesed the Senate. And, most remarkable of all—an element which cannot be over-estimated in the teaching of the forceful speaking style—his vehemence awakens comparatively little resentment in those auditors who differ from his views. This ability to be both frank and persuasive, to be tactful at the very moment when he least appears to care for tactfulness, has always been characteristic of Reed and has saved him in many elections when he was opposed by a combination of the influential men of both parties. The exact nature of this unusual ability is difficult to discern, but his anti-prohibition speech gives at least a hint of the secret. Perhaps his power lies in his comparative freedom from any mean or personal bitterness. Perhaps it is the expansive, far-reaching manner in which he ignores all petty purposes and stirs the auditors to a similar liberality. Certainly it is difficult to dislike for any length of time a speaker who combines high purpose and daring execution. The methods of Reed—studied critically, of course—are well worth analysis and a certain degree of imitation. It is a common criticism of modern speakers that their speeches lack the "fire" and the whole-hearted

intensity of those of former days. We have become very conscious, even overly conscious, of the opinions, the prejudices, and the conditioned reactions of the audience. Many of our speeches have become tactful and persuasive, and in becoming so have lacked that sincerity and vigor which constitute the soul of oratory.

Borah's reply to Reed is somewhat of a disappointment. Although it is far above the average of Senate debates, it can hardly be called a great speech, and only a great speech would have been a completely fitting reply to Reed's indictment of prohibition enforcement. Borah's reply is reasonable in its tone and conciliatory in its nature, and probably reassured the overwhelming majority of senators who already had resolved to vote for the Jones bill. Yet certain of the very virtues of the speech keep it from being a great forensic effort. Borah begins by paying a warm tribute to Reed for his long and brilliant record in the Senate. Although this is a gracious act, and although Reed more than deserved the praise, the mildness of the beginning made it obvious that no personal conflict was possible between the two men. They might and did differ concerning prohibition, but the mutual sympathies of two titans who had for years fought a common battle against congressional mediocrities must prevent them from assuming that fight-to-the-finish attitude which gave vitality and interest to the Webster-Hayne and the Lincoln-Douglas debates. It has not been mere chance that these two men, belonging to opposite political parties, have rarely clashed during the many years in which each has played a prominent part in our political life.

Borah further weakened his stand by stating that when a better solution than prohibition was found to the problem of drinking, he would favor it. This Buick-like promise exposed him to criticism by other senators later in the debate. But Borah very wisely put the enforcement of the prohibition law on a long-time basis. On the whole, however, his defense could have given little encouragement to the dry forces who, fortunately for them, are not particularly in need of additional encouragement. But despite his rather mild defense of present-day enforcement, Borah did very thoroughly expose the fundamental weakness of Reed's speech, his failure to find a solution to the problem other than a return to state option, that time-worn and utterly worthless haven, the demo-

cratic doctrine of state's rights. And yet, although soundly argumentative, Borah's speech, taken as a whole, does not rise to the heights reached by Reed's spirited attack. Time after time in speeches both in and out of Congress, especially in those dealing with our foreign policies, Borah has far excelled his reply to Reed.

Yet the debate is worthy of careful study. The curse of most reviews is that the reader is thereby saved from reading the original documents. I trust that this review will not have so malignant an effeet.

EDWIN H. PAGET, *Syracuse University*

IN THE PERIODICALS

[Items for this department should be sent to A. Craig Baird, University of Iowa.]

GRAY, T. C. *The Purpose and Value of Oral Reading in the Intermediate and Upper Grades of the Elementary School.* The Elementary Journal, Vol. XXIX, pp. 335-343, January, 1929.

This article is cogent and timely. When so much interest in silent reading is being manifested, in some cases to the exclusion of oral reading, it is well that some one re-state the values of oral reading. Mr. Gray's reasons for teaching oral reading are logical. Perhaps even greater emphasis should be placed on the fact that oral reading demands that the child should have a complete understanding of his material and that he should get the "feel" of it. The child also clarifies and crystalizes his thinking by oral rendition.

In one of his generalizations Mr. Gray states that oral reading has value sufficient to justify a revival of interest "provided its aims and methods are modified." Educators in general will agree with this statement. The disrepute into which oral reading has fallen has been caused, not by lack of appreciation of its value, but by inadequate teaching. Therefore, the obvious thing to do to restore it is to secure teachers who have been trained to teach it. Shouldn't all grade teachers be required to have courses in oral interpretation and in the teaching of oral reading?

M. OCLO MILLER, *State University of Iowa*

PAGET, EDWIN H. *The Overlapping of Speech and English.* The English Journal, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, March, 1929.

The author in this article points out that the constant specialization in the field of Speech is gradually taking it from under the direction of the English Department. The author asserts that

though each may gain from an administrative point of view, each will suffer certain losses if this cleavage goes too far.

Paget takes up the psychology of persuasion as presented in the average speech class. The speaker must "gain and hold the attention of the audience; he must arouse the dissatisfaction of the audience with their present condition by making each individual conscious of a definite and personal need; the speaker must then present a specific plan which will definitely satisfy that felt need; if possible, he must induce the individuals in the audience to visualize the benefits which they would obtain once the proposed plan is in operation, thus intensifying the desire for the plan; and that, last and most important, the speaker must induce the audience to act."

Over against this point of view are the standards of the English teacher with the stress on exposition, narration, description, and argumentation. If the student has mastered the "stylistics" and can write "clearly and with reasonable correctness, the instructor will be satisfied."

Paget sees a danger here. "The teacher of speech, because of his interest in the psychology of persuasion, has neglected the style, a vital part of any persuasive appeal; the teacher of English, because of his interest in style, has often neglected the other elements of persuasion, without which any composition will lack the highest effectiveness." Thus the need of a proper correlation of the two fields.

Although I agree with the author that English and Speech have much in common, I welcome the cleavage that is taking place. For many years, in our colleges and universities, Speech has been a side issue of the English Department. As such it has had little chance to show what contribution it could make to the field of theoretical or applied knowledge. It is only as the Speech Department is an administratively separate Department that we can ever hope for the best results.

Speech has a province and a contribution all of its own. As Woolbert suggests, it deals with ideas, language, voice and body. The province of English is the effective expression of ideas for a *reading* public. It is a noteworthy fact that a good essay is usually a poor oration. The speaker, although using grammar and rhetoric, must learn the effective expression of his ideas for a *listening*

audience. Skill in this regard is seldom to be gained from the mechanics of English. It is here that our Speech work is making a valid contribution. The struggle of Speech to stand administratively on its own feet has been amply justified as educational practice.

FLOYD W. LAMBERTSON, *State University of Iowa*

SWIGERT, J. MACK. *Can Debating Survive?* The New Student. Vol. 8, No. 7, pp. 7-9, April, 1929.

This article, by the head of the Harvard University Debating Council, gives added proof of the *New Student's* interest in forensics, an interest which led the editor in the March issue to label debating a chronic invalid and to pray for its deliverance from the formalism of the debate coaches. Incidentally, the editor, on page 3 of this issue, retires from his first position somewhat, quoting a letter of mine at length, though throwing over it the veil of anonymity.

Mr. Swigert says that interest in debating has declined in the past thirty years, particularly at Harvard and Yale. The reasons he gives are these: the fairly general suspicion that debating is an immoral activity, encouraging hypocrisy; the increase in the number and attractiveness of other evening amusements; the feeling that victory in debating doesn't mean very much; and the tendency of the student to go to things that actually interest him rather to those which "school spirit" bids him attend. After pronouncing a benediction over the corpse of the old type of debate (would that the corpse were as cold as Mr. Swigert thinks it!) he suggests that the new debate must be interesting, entertaining, and fair-minded in attitude.

Most of these things have long been known to debate coaches and teachers of speech. It is of some importance, however, that they have been said again by a student, especially since the student comes from a part of the country where, in a number of colleges, the old technique has hung on tenaciously.

RAYMOND F. HOWES, *Washington University*

WHITE, HENRY ADELBERT. *The Recent Trend in Debating.* The English Journal (College Edition), Vol. XVIII, No. 4, pp. 320-329, April, 1929.

Professor White admirably sums up and interprets the recent trend in debating. In addition he offers an apologia for the practice of argument. He refutes by aid of numerous facts the four or five recent articles that in effect pronounce debating defunct. He considers the increasing number of debates, the astonishing activity of such organizations as Pi Kappa Delta, the expansion of women's debating, international debating, high-school leagues, the influence of British speaking upon the American style, the evolution toward the more "open" style in debate, the Oregon plan, and other innovations and the numerous forms of decision, including the use of the expert judge.

This article would be even more effective had the author pointed out carefully the distinction between "coach" and director of forensics. Moreover, any diagnosis of the recent trend should also stress the prevalence of off-campus debates and note the increasing disposition of intercollegiate teams to broadcast.

The article is to be recommended to the layman who wishes an authoritative summary of debating as practiced in the year 1929 in school and college; also to those school and college "coaches" who are still fighting for victory and using the same sharp military strategy and defensive armor plate which were heavily relied upon twenty years ago.

A. C. B.

NEWS AND NOTES

[Material for this department should be sent directly to Miss Lousene Rousseau, 30 Clinton Street, Brooklyn, New York.]

Radio broadcasting, by placing a premium upon a pleasant voice and general effectiveness in speech habits, is commanding the increasing interest and attention of teachers of speech. The British Broadcasting Corporation has undertaken a new educational service which includes regular radio-casting to the school classrooms, where many thousands of British children enjoy lessons by radio in English, poetry, music, history, and related subjects.

A similar undertaking has been launched by Ohio—a School of the Air, sponsored by the Department of Education of the State of Ohio, with the cooperation of the Ohio State University and the Columbus studios. In the past three months WLW has broadcast voices of governors, poets, state and national officers, national heroes, presidents, prominent educators, natural scientists, leading actors, etc. The popularity of the Radio School, it is hoped, will eventually lead to the incorporation of the school into the regular public school curriculum and a reorganization of the studies and periods to provide for its more effective energization to the school program.

In this same connection teachers of Speech have been interested in the contest sponsored by the American Academy of Arts and Letters to determine the radio announcer with the best diction. The contest, which attracted wide attention, resulted in the selection of Milton J. Cross, announcer of WJZ. Medals were also awarded to Edith Wharton for literature, and to Julia Marlowe for diction on the stage. Hamlin Garland, the chairman of the committee having charge of the radio award, has invited the cooperation of teachers of speech in the award of the medals in the future. The audition for next year begins immediately. Any regularly employed official announcer is eligible, and the judgments are to be based upon the regular service. The qualifications for consideration are: pronunciation, articulation, quality of tone, accent, general cultural effect. The committee in charge of the award are: Dr. John H. Finley, Professor George Pierce Baker, Augustus Thomas, Robert Underwood Johnson, and Hamlin Garland. Teachers of speech who wish to commend announcers to the favorable attention of the committee should address Hamlin Garland at 507 Cathedral Parkway, New York City. In a letter to the editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH Mr. Garland says: "The directors of the Academy believe that the radio is one of the most powerful cultural

agencies the world has ever seen and that it should be given the same careful study as to its influence on the young, that the talking picture now demands. Educators cannot afford to ignore its potentialities for evil as well as for good. We desire the informal cooperation of the leading teachers of spoken English throughout the Nation."

The study of language *per se* is steadily gaining increased recognition, as being fundamental for the proper understanding of spoken speech and of literature. In 1924 the Linguistic Society of America was founded, "for the advancement of the scientific study of language"; the Society holds annual meetings for the reading of papers and has established several series of publications. In 1927, certain of its members formed a plan for a Linguistic Institute, which was accordingly held in the summer of 1928, using the facilities of Yale University, which were generously placed at its disposal. The Linguistic Society has authorized a second session of the Institute in 1929, to be held in New Haven from July 8 to August 16.

The Linguistic Institute, like the Society, stands as sponsor to research projects in language; but unlike the Society, whose creation it is, it also conducts courses of graduate grade, limited to strictly linguistic subjects. These courses are valuable to graduate students, to high-school and college teachers who feel the need of acquaintance with linguistic science or with the history of a particular language or group of languages, and to scholars who wish to familiarize themselves with remoter bits of linguistic territory. Teachers of speech will perhaps be most interested in the following courses: *American Pronunciation*, by Prof. Hans Kurath, Ohio State University; *Historical Syntax* of the English Language, by Prof. G. O. Curme, Northwestern University; *Old English*, by Prof. Kemp Malone, The Johns Hopkins University; *Philological Phonetics*, by Prof. G. O. Russell, Ohio State University; *Experimental Phonetics*, by Prof. Russell; *The Sociological Study of Language*, by Prof. R. E. Saleski, Bethany College. There is a course in the *Psychology of Language*, the instructor in which has been obliged to withdraw on account of illness, but another scholar is expected to take his place. Recently, two courses for teachers of the deaf have been announced, *Speech Articulation*, and *Auricular Training: Correction of Defects in Speech and Voice Quality*, by Prof. Russell, who will adjust his other courses in some way or will secure aid in the conduct of the work in his charge. But there are other courses, ranging from a *General Introduction* by Prof. Edward Prokosch of Yale University through Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Romance, Germanic, Irish, Balto-Slavonic, to Hittite, Semitic, Chinese, and Philippine Languages: a total of thirty-eight courses conducted by twenty-one scholars from thirteen universities and colleges. During the session there will be an important public conference on American Dialects of English and the survey which is planned for the recording and study of them.

Membership in the Linguistic Institute is open to all persons interested. One inclusive fee of Seventy-five Dollars entitles members to

attend any or all of the courses; accomodations in the Yale dormitories are available at reasonable rates. Circulars are obtainable from Prof. E. H. Sturtevant, Director of the Linguistic Institute, 1849 Yale Station, New Haven.

ROLOND G. KENT,
Secretary of the Linguistic Society of America
University of Pennsylvania.

The Department of Speech at the University of Michigan will have as members of its summer staff: Professors J. M. O'Neill, C. L. Meader, W. B. Pillsbury, Louis M. Eich, Leon H. Strong, and G. E. Densmore. Instructors are: E. E. Fleischman, F. K. Riley, V. B. Windt, C. B. Miller, and Hide Shohara. Visiting members will be Professor Chester Wallace, of the Carnegie Institute of Technology and Professor Robert West, of the University of Wisconsin. The department will have available for its summer work, in addition to regular offices and classrooms, a laboratory, a clinic, a large new seminar room for the use of the graduate groups, the new theatre in the Michigan League Building for its major public productions, and the little theatre and workshop in University Hall for its dramatic classes and private laboratory presentations. Special activities will include courses in the theatre arts, speech correction, and in the teaching and coaching of debate.

Another summer session which will interest many teachers of Speech is the summer Institute of Euthenics at Vassar College, which will be held from June 24 to August 3, and which includes on its faculty Dr. Smiley Blanton and Margaret Gray Blanton. Among the courses they will offer will be courses in Mental Hygiene, Child Guidance, Speech Development and Correction, and related courses. In connection with these courses a nursery school will be maintained under the direction of Dr. Blanton, and will serve as a laboratory for the courses. Further information concerning the Institute may be secured from Vassar College.

Summer courses in England will also attract a number of American teachers of Speech this summer. Among those offering special attractions are the Summer School of Speech Training at Oxford from July 29 to August 10, where there will be special courses in Voice Training, Phonology, Public Speaking, Lyric and Dramatic Verse Speaking, Reading and Recitation, and Speech Defects. There will also be a daily lecture on Phonetics, with classes for study and discussion. Then the Central School of Speech Training and Dramatic Art will hold a Summer School of Drama at Malvern, from August 19 to 31, during the time of the Bernard Shaw Festival.

The twentieth annual meeting of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference was held during the first week of April at Princeton University. Under the direction of Hoyt H. Hudson, of Princeton University, President of the Conference, the following programs were scheduled:

FRIDAY MORNING, APRIL FIFTH

Greeting——President John Grier Hibben, Princeton University
On Standardizing Pronunciation—J. Duncan Spaeth, Princeton University
Variety in Thought and Speech Forms
Mrs. Gladys Murphy Graham, University of California at Los Angeles
The Little Theatre in the College
S. Marion Tucker, Booklyn Polytechnic Institute

FRIDAY AFTERNOON—SECTION ON SPEECH PROBLEMS

Sara M. Stinchfield, Mt. Holyoke College, Chairman
Diagnosis of Stammering in the Light of Hemato-Respiratory Studies
Dr. E. B. Twitmyer, University of Pennsylvania
Discussion by Elizabeth D. McDowell, Columbia University
Henrietta Prentiss, Hunter College
Alvin C. Busse, New York University
Tirzah Nichols, Baldwin School, Philadelphia
William Farma, New York University
Samuel D. Robbins, American Society for the Study of Disorders of Speech

SECTION ON DRAMATICS

John Dolman, Jr., University of Pennsylvania, Chairman
Discussion by Wilbur J. Kay, West Virginia University
Philip Hicks, Swarthmore College
Grosvenor Robinson, Bates College
J. Walter Reeves, Peddie School

SECTION ON PUBLIC SPEAKING AND DEBATE

Myron J. Luch, Lehigh University, Chairman
The Evolution of the Teaching of Delivery
Charles A. Fritz, New York University
Commonplaces in Southern Thought
Marvin G. Bauer, Washington and Lee University
Mental Hygiene Technique in Teaching Speech
Wayne Morse, University of Minnesota
Debating and Educational Theory—Edwin L. Paget, Syracuse University

SECTION ON INTERPRETATIVE READING

Vera A. Sickels, Smith College, Chairman
Discussion by Wayland M. Parrish, University of Pittsburgh
Miss I. C. Couch, Mt. Holyoke College
W. H. Bridge, Hunter College
Algernon Tassin, Columbia University
Frederic C. Packard, Harvard University
Lillian Stevens, St. Agatha's School for Girls, New York
Vernetta F. Decker, Trenton Normal School

SATURDAY MORNING, APRIL SIXTH

Debating Around the World—Mervin Ames, Sanford High School, Maine
An Ideal Course for the School: How near can we come to it?
Robert Illingworth, The Swavely School

The Institute of the Linguistic Society of America
Roland G. Kent, University of Pennsylvania
Speech Disorders and the Emotional Life
Dr. Smiley Blanton, Vassar College

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SECTION

Grosvenor Robinson, Bates College, Chairman
Mechanisms of Careless Speech——R. C. Borden, New York University
The Public Speaker and Public Opinion
William Starr Myers, Princeton University

SECONDARY SCHOOL SECTION

J. Walter Reeves, Peddie School, Chairman
Extempore Speaking——Rupert L. Cortright, Syracuse University
Dramatics in Secondary Schools
Olive Dillon, Evander Childs High School, New York City
Creating and Recreating Poetry in the High School
Mary E. Cramer, Hunter College High School, New York City

The following program was presented at the meeting of the Michigan Association of Teachers of Speech, which was held at the University of Michigan, April 26:

MORNING SESSION

Speech Disorders and the Public Schools——Ida Hintz McKay
What do Michigan High Schools Offer in Speech Training——Preston Scott
Possibilities of the Drama in Michigan High Schools——Earl Fleischman
Original One-Act Play by the University of Michigan Play Production Class

AFTERNOON SESSION

As the Debate Manager Sees Debating——G. E. Densmore
Our Michigan High-School Extempore Contests——J. Fred McGrew
Our Michigan High-School Oratorical Contests——F. W. Frostic
The Educator's Supreme Responsibility——Andrew Thomas Weaver

At noon a luncheon was held at the Michigan Union, and Louis M. Eich, of the University of Michigan, gave a reading. In the evening was held the twelfth annual State Championship Debate of the Michigan High-School Debating League.

The general program of the Pacific Forensic League's Sixth Annual Conference was included in this department in April. Since then details of some of the meetings have been received which are interesting enough to warrant repetition with greater detail. In particular the session on debating would seem to arouse interest.

Experiments in Improving the Rules Governing Rebuttal Speeches—
Discussion led by Alan Nichols, University of Southern California

1. Changing the Order
2. The Number of Rebuttals on Each Side
3. Scaling the Time Limits
4. Otherwise Altering the Time Limits
5. The Affirmative Rejoinder
6. Other Experiments

Experience with Various Types of Intercollegiate Debates—Discussion led by W. H. Veatch, State College of Washington

1. The Traditional American System
2. The Twenty-Four Hour Plan
3. Mixed Teams
4. Split Teams
5. Open Forum
6. The Cross-Question Method
7. The "Oxford Style"
8. Other Types

Decisions in Debate—Led by Earl W. Wells, Oregon State College

1. The Three-Judge System
2. A Larger Board of Judges
3. The Single Critic Judge
4. The Audience Decision
5. Non-decision
6. The Judging of Various Types of Debates
7. Instructions to the Judges
8. Improving the Judging of Debates

Speech correction work has been added to the curriculum of the Speech Department of Butler University. Beginning and advanced work are now offered, under the direction of Herbert E. Rahe, who is likewise chairman of the Speech Correction Section of the state association of teachers of Speech.

From the University of Arizona comes an interesting report of the development of the Speech Department there. In the past four years it has grown from a department of one full-time and one part-time teacher, offering sixteen units of work, to a department of four full-time instructors, offering thirty-seven units of work, and sponsoring elaborate activities in the university and in the state. A year ago the Arizona Junior College Speech Arts League was organized, absorbing the old Junior College Debating League, affiliating with the Arizona Intercollegiate Peace Oratorical Association, and starting new state contests in extemporaneous speaking and interpretative reading. Arizona also supports a High-School Debating League, and stages an annual state contest in oratory. Recently there have been added local, district, and state contests in extemporaneous speaking and interpretative reading. The most recent activity to be added was the Arizona State Drama Association, which opens its membership to university, college, and high-school groups, little theatres, independent dramatic clubs, etc. This organization now sponsors annual contests in one-act plays, stage models, and high schools.

The National Forensic League, an organization of secondary schools similar to the Pi Kappa Delta organization for colleges, now numbers 225 chapters in thirty-three states, and publishes a monthly bulletin for its

members. Bruno E. Jacob, of Ripon College, Wisconsin, is secretary of the League.

Forensic activities at Butler University have been numerous this year. Men's debating teams have debated Albion College, De Pauw University, Miami University, Earlham College, Wabash College, and Indiana University. Varsity women have met Franklin College, Evansville College, De Pauw University, and the University of Cincinnati. The freshmen debated Purdue University. The Varsity men's team also engaged in extensive debating during an eastern trip late in the spring. Questions used have concerned the criminal code question, the jury question, and the question of requiring a sentence of life imprisonment on the fourth conviction of a felony. Butler also competes in the Indiana State Oratorical League, which is a member of the Inter-State Oratorical League, and in the State Peace Oratorical Contest and the State Intercollegiate Constitutional Contest.

A new Metropolitan Collegiate Debating League has just been organized in New York City, with Brooklyn City College, Long Island University, and Seth Low Junior College as its members. The first series of debates was held late in March.

Phi Rho Pi, a new national honorary forensic society for junior colleges, held its first National Convention at Grand Rapids on May fourth. Nearly twenty junior colleges are listed as charter members of the organization, which will sponsor annual contests in the various fields of forensics. There is also a Michigan College Debating League, which comprises seven Junior Colleges of the state, and which awards a cup annually for the championship. Bay City Junior College has been experimenting with debates of different length, in the endeavor to fit such a contest into an hour. Each team is now allowed two constructive speeches of seven minutes each and two rebuttal speeches of seven minutes each. This arrangement is reported to be more satisfactory than the old arrangement of three ten-minute speeches and three five-minute rebuttals per team. The audience found it more interesting throughout, and the debaters found time ample to present their cases, but only when they eliminated minor points of all kinds. H. C. Klingbeil, who is chairman of the Department of Speech of the Bay City, Michigan, Junior College, would be interested to hear of the experience of others who have experimented with the short debate.

The University of Denver has a new playhouse, in the new Mayo Hall there. The auditorium seats about three hundred. The stage is twenty feet deep and thirty feet wide, the width of the proscenium arch being twenty-four feet. The floor is trapped across its entire width. Stage lighting equipment includes an elaborate central switchboard, concealable footlights, borders, spots, floods, etc., and tow dimmers to control both

stage and house lights. Two very large rooms under the stage provide space for work and storage, and two large dressing rooms are well equipped with mirrors and lights. There is running water in all these rooms, and showers adjacent to each dressing room. The theatre was dedicated with a performance of Milne's *The Romantic Age.*

The Northwestern University School of Speech is offering full tuition ($400.00) for a year of study in playwriting and allied subjects to the author of the best play submitted under the following rules:

1. Contestant must be a student, graduate or undergraduate, in a college or university.
2. He must submit a play, preferably a one-act, on or before August 15, 1929.

Manuscripts should be sent to the Play Contest Committee, School of Speech, Evanston, Illinois. Further information about the contest may be obtained from Dean Ralph Dennis of that institution.

Among the dramatic performances at Butler University this year have been Clemence Dane's *Naboth's Vineyard*, presented for the first time in the United States; *Passing Strange*, by David Clarke; *What Men Live By*, by Virginia Church; Kelly's *Poor Aubrey;* Masefield's *The Locked Chest;* Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest;* and a Shakespearian production, which will end the season. Mrs. Eugene Fife is coaching the plays.

The Children's Theatre of the Emerson School in Boston closed its tenth season a few weeks ago with *The Patchwork Girl of Oz*, adapted from the famous *Wizard of Oz* stories by Irma Lemke of the playwriting course.

Performances at the University of Montana this year have included Bruno Frank's *Twelve Thousand*, translated from the German by William A. Drake, Barrie's *Shall We Join the Ladies?*', Sierra's *Wife to a Famous Man*, and a final play, which is to be either Robinson's *The White-Headed Boy*, or O'Casey's *Juno and the Paycock*. William Angus is director of dramatics at Montana.

Princeton and Bryn Mawr students appeared in a joint performance of Barrie's *Admirable Crichton* at Bryn Mawr College in April.

PERSONALS

William Farma, of New York University, will teach this summer at the University of Buffalo.

Mrs. Eugene Fife of Butler University will spend the summer at the University of Iowa. Claude Sifritt, also of Butler University, plans to do work at the University of Michigan this summer.

Dr. Robert Hannah, formerly of the University of Michigan, has